

After joining in a federation with other Central American States and dissolving it, but our marines still controlling the country, an election was held in 1923. Solorzano and Sacasa were elected by a vote of 48,000 to 28,000. A fight arose between Chamorro and Solorzano, and Vice President Sacasa was run out of the country. Chamorro became the dictator, and afterwards Diaz was virtually appointed by the United States to fill out the unexpired term of Solorzano. Late in 1926 he was elected President and the United States recognized him and has kept him in office ever since. In April, 1927, the President appointed Henry L. Stimson his special representative to go to Nicaragua and adjust things. He finally brought out an agreement that an election was to be held for President, and the "generals" on both sides agreed to it, except Sandino. Whether the agreement for a fair election means anything is exceedingly doubtful.

The finances of Nicaragua are in a bad shape. The Nicaraguans owe more than they can pay, and with their constant revolutions it seems impossible for the Government to get out of debt.

Again I say there is but one way we can help, and that is to build the canal. And while we help them in this way we help ourselves infinitely more, and at the same time do not dishonor our Constitution, do not dishonor our Government, and do not dishonor our flag.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me say that I have no sympathy with keeping our marines in Nicaragua, but I have the greatest sympathy for the people of that country in their efforts to maintain their liberty. I believe that if we shall go there in the way I have proposed and spend our money to build this canal in their interest as well as ours, and in the interest of the commerce of the world, we could not do the Nicaraguans a greater service nor could we do our own country or the world a greater service. By adopting this peaceful method, in my judgment, we will bring about a settlement of their dispute, encourage men to go to work in the peaceful vocations of life rather than to be arrayed as revolutionists on one side or the other. It seems to me that we can carry out this project without financial loss, but, on the contrary, with an enormous financial gain. I therefore hope that the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals will report the bill and that Congress may pass it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

RECESS

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 28, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 27, 1928

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Mary E. Catts, Washington.

IOWA

Charles O. McLean, Ankeny.
Grace F. Newton, Dickens.
Edward A. Hansen, Holstein.
Marinus Jansma, Hospers.
Fred R. Foster, Humeston.
Ray C. Edmonds, Le Mars.
John E. Klutts, Mondamin.
Leon R. Valentine, Murray.
Perry B. Wilson, Shannon City.
Wayne C. Solleder, Thurman.
Ora L. Garton, Weldon.

KANSAS

Jessie W. Lloyd, Athol.
Anna L. Miller, Bushton.
Bessie Custer, Satanta.
James P. Kelley, White Cloud.

MAINE

Charles C. McLaughlin, Harmony.

MASSACHUSETTS

Edwin C. Howe, Enfield.
Henry D. Ainsworth, Grafton.
Charles M. Edwards, Sterling.

OHIO

Henry Kemper, Bellefontaine.
Edgar C. Allison, Cumberland.
Francis E. Cook, Galion.
Oliver Ferrell, Paulding.
George F. Barto, State Soldiers' Home.
Nathan S. Hall, Summerfield.

TENNESSEE

John B. Waters, Sevierville.

TEXAS

John A. McFarland, Ladonia.
Llewellyn R. Atkins, New Boston.
Josie I. Coleman, Tehuacana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, March 27, 1928

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Glory be to Thee, O Lord most high; heaven and earth are filled with Thy glory and praise becometh the upright in heart. All Thy works do praise Thee: The dawning of spring with its promise and hope brings Thee very near our responsive hearts. The bursting bud, the incipient bloom, the rapture of birds, the sun-kissed waters—these all tell of Thy glory. Do Thou help our souls to rise above the drab, leaden things of life, pushing their virtues upward through worldly pressure and shaping themselves mysteriously into the image of Thy dear Son. Make us tremendously ambitious for the simple gains and joys of human experience, with all their love, peace, and tenderness. The friendship of true friends, the laughter of little children, the sight of flowers, the strains of sweet music, and the heart talks of the hearthstone—bless us with these and we shall make no complaints. In the name of Jesus. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INTERNATIONAL EMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION CONFERENCE

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on House bill 10167, relating to the Second International Emigration and Immigration Conference to be held at Habana.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to file a supplemental report on the bill referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SNELL, from the Committee on Rules, submits the following report, to accompany H. Res. 148, for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 113, S. 716, and H. R. 12407.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I expect to call up that resolution on Thursday after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table. The first bill provided for by the committee is the one dealing with national origins.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman insert in the Record the committees that reported these various bills?

Mr. SNELL. There are just three bills from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. They are all from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization?

Mr. SNELL. Yes. I think they are all practically unanimous-consent agreements.

The SPEAKER. Referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit another report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SNELL, from the Committee on Rules, submits the following report, to accompany H. Res. 149, for the consideration of H. R. 279:

"The Committee on Rules reports the House Resolution 149 to the House, with the recommendation that the resolution be adopted. The resolution provides for the consideration of H. R. 279, to amend sec-

tion 8 of the act entitled 'An act to incorporate the Howard University in the District of Columbia,' approved March 2, 1867."

The SPEAKER. Referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, for Mr. MICHENER I submit another report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MICHENER, from the Committee on Rules, submits the following report, to accompany House Resolution 150, for the consideration of H. R. 8937:

"The Committee on Rules reports House Resolution 150 to the House, with the recommendation that the resolution be adopted. The resolution provides for the consideration of H. R. 8937, to amend the act entitled 'An act to promote export trade, and for other purposes,' approved April 6, 1918."

The SPEAKER. Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I understand that that bill is reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. SNELL. No. It is reported by the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESIGNATION FROM THE COMMITTEE TO ATTEND UNVEILING EXERCISES OF STATUE ON STONE MOUNTAIN OF GEN. ROBERT E. LEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 26, 1928.

HON. NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I regret to advise that recent uncontrollable circumstances will prevent my acceptance of the appointment which you were so good as to tender me on the congressional committee to attend the unveiling exercises of the statue on Stone Mountain of Gen. Robert E. Lee.

Very respectfully,

A. J. MONTAGUE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints Representative L. J. STEELE, of Georgia, to fill the vacancy.

THE GOLIAD MASSACRE—ITS PLACE IN HISTORY

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] for one hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, to-day is the ninety-second anniversary of one of the most barbarous, most revolting, and most heart-rending scenes ever perpetrated by men in ancient or modern times. On Palm Sunday, March 27, 1836, at Goliad, Tex., Col. J. W. Fannin, jr., a soldier and officer in the army for the independence of Texas, with about 330 men under his command, all of whom were prisoners of war, were marched from their prison at daylight and shot to death without warning.

I desire to review, briefly, the events leading up to that horrible tragedy, the circumstances under which it was committed, and its bearing upon subsequent events. In order to give a more thorough understanding of the situation, I have here a large map of Texas showing the geographical location of Goliad, and other points having a historical bearing.

Goliad [pointing] is located here on the San Antonio River about 40 miles from the Gulf of Mexico. San Antonio, then known as Bexar, is on the same river about 80 miles above, and to the northwest of Goliad. Gonzales is on the Guadalupe River about 55 miles north of Goliad. Victoria is 28 miles to the east, also on the Guadalupe. Refugio is about 30 miles to the south of Goliad, and San Patricio about 60 miles to the southwest. San Felipe is on the Brazos, about 120 miles northeast of Goliad, and San Jacinto, about 150 miles to the northeast, near the present city of Houston.

At San Antonio and Goliad are located old Spanish missions, which, at the time we now have under consideration, 1835 and 1836, were used as forts or military posts. The one at San Antonio is called the Alamo, and was erected by the Franciscan friars about the year 1718. The one at Goliad is called La Bahia, and was erected by monks of the same order about the year 1749. Refugio was also the seat of an old mission, known as the Mission Del Refugio.

Gonzales was the seat of one of the early American settlements, known as De Witt's colony. It is called the Lexington of Texas, as it was there, on October 2, 1835, the first skirmish was fought for Texas, and which resulted in a victory for the Texans. Victoria was also the seat of a colonial settlement,

known as the De Leon colony. Refugio and San Patricio were small Irish settlements.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will my friend from Texas explain that section of his interesting map embraced within the red lines?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That represents one of the greatest congressional districts in the United States. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNELL. I thank the gentleman, and would add that it is very worthily and capably represented in the House by one of its ablest Members.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the gentleman for the compliment.

San Felipe was the seat of the provisional government of Texas. It was located in Stephen F. Austin's colony, though Austin's home was farther down the Brazos River, in which is now Brazoria County. San Jacinto is where the final victory was won that made Texas independent and paved the way for its admission to the American Union as one of the 48 States of the present.

Under Mexican domination Texas had been attached for administrative purposes to the State of Coahuila. Saltillo, the capital, was several hundred miles from the American settlements, and much of the territory intervening was uninhabited. Santa Anna had overthrown the constitutional government in Mexico and had military posts at San Antonio and Goliad to force Texas into submission.

The fight at Gonzales of October 2, 1835, occurred when a force of about 150 men under Castinada was sent from San Antonio to take possession of a small cannon which had been given to the colonists by the Mexican Government several years before as a protection against the Indians.

To the demand of Castinada an evasive reply was at first made, and, as in 1775, minute men were sent out to gather in the colonists. The following morning, a sufficient number having arrived, they then made a positive refusal. The fight resulted. Castinada was forced to return to San Antonio without the cannon, and after the loss of several men.

This victory of the Texans was followed by several others in rapid succession. One week later Goliad fell into their hands. In another 20 days they won the important Battle of Concepcion. They then laid siege to San Antonio, which capitulated on December 9. General Cos and his army were permitted to return to Mexico under agreement not to further resist the return of Mexico to the constitution of 1824. This agreement they afterwards violated.

All this fighting occurred before there was any organized effort for Texan independence. The main purpose was to resist the usurper, Santa Anna, and reestablish constitutional government in Mexico, of which Texas was a part. For self-preservation during the time such government was suspended, the Texans, on November 3, established a provisional government at San Felipe, consisting of a governor and council. A declaration of independence was adopted at Goliad on December 20, 1835, but this was disapproved by the council who ordered it suppressed.

San Antonio, Goliad, Refugio, and San Patricio, all being in the hands of the Texans, it was the object of the council to concentrate these forces in a march upon Matamoras, across the Rio Grande, with a hope that it would cause an uprising of the Mexicans in the States of Tamaulipas and Nuevo Leon and aid in the overthrow of Santa Anna. While this plan had the approval of the council, it was opposed by Smith, the governor. It was also opposed by Sam Houston, who had been appointed at the head of the army, but Houston's authority was not fully recognized at that time, and in some quarters it was disputed.

Here Colonel Fannin enters prominently into the drama. He was in command of about 400 men at Goliad, under the orders of the council. Grant and Johnson had smaller forces at San Patricio. All these officers were expected to take important parts in the proposed Mexican invasion. The whole proposition was ill-advised, as fully shown by subsequent events. Instead of advancing into Mexico, it was later found that the Texan force was incapable of defending the advanced positions they then held.

The combined forces of Fannin, Grant, and Johnson amounted only to 600 or 700 men, untrained, poorly armed and equipped. Santa Anna was at that time advancing upon Texas with 8,000 seasoned troops, well armed and equipped, and flushed with their recent victories over Zacatecas, the last of the Mexican States to fall before his power. His right wing, under Urrea, was then concentrating at Matamoras, the Texan objective.

Santa Anna, with the main body of his troops, soon advanced to San Antonio and laid siege to the Alamo, which fell into his hands March 6 after one of the most heroic defenses recorded in the annals of history. Bowie, the Georgian; Travis, the Ala-

bamian, Bonham, of South Carolina; and Davy Crockett, the Tennessean—but all Texans—fell at their posts with about 180 men under their command. Not one retreated; not one surrendered; not one was spared.

On March 1, 1836, a convention was assembled at Washington on the Brazos. It was by this time the almost universal opinion that complete independence was the only hope for stable government in Texas. The following day the declaration was adopted, and Sam Houston appointed commander in chief of the armies. A few days later a president and vice president ad interim were elected by the convention. The provisional council, which had previously been acting, then turned over the affairs to this new government.

Supposing the Alamo to be still in the hands of the Texans, but besieged by Santa Anna, Houston started to its relief. He arrived at Gonzales on March 11, where he received the word that the Alamo had fallen on the 6th and that the entire Texan force had been put to death. Houston had with him at Gonzales 374 men but with few arms and little ammunition. Fannin was then at Goliad with about 400 men.

Knowing that resistance on that exposed front was suicidal, Houston decided to retreat to the Colorado. He dispatched a courier to Fannin with orders to retreat to Victoria on the east side of the Guadalupe. This order was sent on the night of the 11th, the day of Houston's arrival in Gonzales. Two days later, Houston began his famous retreat eastward, taking with him all the inhabitants of Gonzales.

Santa Anna's men were closing in on Gonzales, on Goliad, and on Refugio. San Patricio had already fallen. Houston continued his march to the Colorado. Fannin did not start his retreat until the 19th of March, five days after the receipt of Houston's order. Goliad by that time was menaced by a large force of the Mexican Army. On the morning of the 19th, the country was enveloped in a dense fog. The oxen that were to pull the cannon and supplies were weak, having been kept up the day and night before without feed.

Fannin started his retreat in the direction of Victoria, but before reaching the Coleta, a small stream, he found it necessary to stop to let the oxen rest and graze. This was about 10 miles from Goliad, near the present town of Fannin. The time was about 2 or 3 o'clock in the afternoon. When he resumed his march he found that the Mexicans were in front of him.

The battle commenced at once, but the Texans were soon completely surrounded on the open prairie. Fannin formed his men in a hollow square and intrenched. The battle continued desperately until stopped by the darkness of the night, and the Mexican force was several times thrown into great disorder and with heavy loss.

It was a dark and horrible night for the Texans. They had no water, and this added greatly to the suffering of the 60 or more wounded, who could not receive necessary medical attention. The two or three small cannon had been put out of action for the want of water to cool them between the shots. Ammunition was also exhausted. A scouting party sent out before the fight commenced, to select a crossing place on the Coleta, were cut off by the enemy and could not rejoin the force.

At daylight on the morning of the 20th, the Mexicans received reinforcements, with several cannon and a pack train of ammunition. Their force was then about 1,900, while the Texan force was less than 400. The oxen had been killed during the fight. There was no way of escape, except by leaving the wounded in the hands of the enemy. This they could not do. After consultation, it was decided that surrender was the only hope of escaping extermination, such as had befallen the defenders of the Alamo three weeks before. A truce was arranged, and the terms agreed upon, by which Fannin and his men were to be accorded treatment due to prisoners of war by civilized nations.

The prisoners were taken back to Goliad and incarcerated in the old mission, where they remained for one week. They were then, on Sunday morning, at dawn of day, marched out in three or four divisions, in as many directions, under false pretenses, and shot down between files of soldiers, in obedience to the order of Santa Anna. Many who were only wounded at the first volley were then stabbed to death with bayonets. A few, but very few, made their escape. About one hour later the wounded were dragged out and butchered. Colonel Fannin himself was badly wounded in the battle a week before. He was the last to die. He met his fate like a soldier. He handed his watch to the officer and requested to be shot in the breast instead of the head. He then seated himself in the chair, tied the handkerchief over his eyes, and bared his bosom to receive the volley.

Urrea, who was in command of the Mexican division operating in that territory, is said to have been at Victoria at the time, and knew nothing of this horrible massacre until it was accomplished. He had left orders for the prisoners to be treated humanely. That order had been superseded by the order of Santa Anna, sent to Goliad from headquarters in San Antonio.

Some of the Mexican officers revolted at this horrible murder, but dared not disobey Santa Anna. A kindly hearted woman, Senora Alvarez, wife of one of the Mexican officers, succeeded in saving several of the Americans by taking them from the prison the night before under various pretexts and concealing them until they could have an opportunity to escape. Four surgeons and a few others were also saved by a Mexican colonel, who took them to his tent where they were concealed and protected. Senora Alvarez, on hearing that the son of Doctor Shackelford was among the slain, burst into tears and said that if she had only known it she would have saved him.

These acts of this good woman are related in the sketch written by Doctor Bernard, of Chicago, who was one of the survivors. Her conduct was also most feelingly referred to by Mr. Benton in the Senate of the United States, when he paid her a most beautiful and adoring tribute.

The exact number who perished at Goliad may never be known, though from facts obtainable it is thought to have been 330. They were young men and boys, coming from almost every State of the Union. Fannin himself was a Georgian, a graduate of West Point. There also perished at Goliad the "Lone Star" flag made by a Georgia girl, Miss Joanna Troutman, who was the stepsister of the late Justice L. Q. C. Lamar, of Mississippi. This flag was brought to Texas by the Georgia company that responded to the call of Texas. It was first unfurled at Velasco, near the home of Stephen F. Austin. Two months later, on receipt of the news of the adoption of the declaration of independence, it was unfurled at Goliad.

The Goliad massacre made a profound impression upon the civilized world, and perhaps more than any other single thing contributed to the final success of the Texan cause, both in battle and in the field of diplomacy. It shared with the Alamo, the battle cry at San Jacinto, where the doom of Santa Anna was sealed in one of the most brilliant victories ever won upon the field of battle.

It gave the Texans the moral support of the civilized world, and was one of the principal causes of the prompt recognition of Texas independence by the United States. It also played an important part in the chain of events leading to the final admission into the Union. It was several times referred to in the debates in Congress when these measures were under consideration. In the House in January, 1845, Mr. Caldwell, of Kentucky, said:

Who can read the cold-blooded massacre of his 400 prisoners of war at Goliad, the detachment of the noble Fannin, without visiting upon its savage author his deepest execrations?

Mr. Norris, of New Hampshire, made this reference:

The horrid and fiendlike butcheries of the Alamo, the heartless treachery and cold-blooded assassination of Goliad only invigorated this brave people with fresh courage, bordering on desperation, to resist even to extermination the murderer of their countrymen, the usurper of their liberties. On the 21st of April, 1836, they sealed their emancipation from Mexican despotism with the blood of their enemies upon the battle field of San Jacinto.

Mr. Benton, in the Senate in 1836, said:

Goliad has torn Texas from Mexico; Goliad has decreed independence; San Jacinto has sealed it. What the massacre decreed the victory has sealed, and the day of the martyrdom of the prisoners must forever be regarded as the day of disunion between Texas and Mexico. * * * I repeat it; that cruel morning of the Alamo, and that black day of Goliad were great political faults. The blood of the martyr is the seed of the church. The blood of slaughtered patriots is the dragon's teeth sown upon the earth, from which heroes, full grown and armed, leap into life, and rush into battle.

Fannin has been both criticized and defended for delaying his retreat from Goliad. He, of course, did not live to give us his version. Houston, in his farewell address in the United States Senate in 1859, used this language:

Fannin, after disobeying orders, attempted on the 19th to retreat and had only 25 miles to reach Victoria. His opinions of chivalry and honor were such that he would not avail himself of the night to do it in, although he had been admonished by the smoke of the enemies' encampment for eight days previous to attempting a retreat. He then attempted to retreat in open day. The Mexican cavalry surrounded

him. He halted in a prairie, without water, commenced a fortification, and there was surrounded by the enemy who, from the hilltops, shot down upon him.

In another connection in this address, Senator Houston said:

Colonel Fannin was ordered to fall back from Goliad. * * * He (Houston) received an answer from Colonel Fannin, stating that he had received his order; had held a council of war; and that he had determined to defend the place, and called it Fort Defiance, and had taken the responsibility to disobey the order.

These criticisms by Senator Houston have been almost universally regarded as an injustice to Colonel Fannin. Yoakum's History of Texas, published in 1855—four years before the farewell address of Senator Houston, is a complete refutation of this charge, afterwards so made. According to Yoakum, Fannin had previously been ordered by Lieutenant Governor Robinson "not to make a retrograde movement" but "await orders and reinforcements." Pending those orders, he had sent King to remove some families at Refugio in distress. Not hearing from King, Ward, with another detachment, had been sent to King's relief, and Ward had not been heard from.

Such was the situation when Fannin received General Houston's order to retreat. Yoakum, on page 87, volume 2, of his history, says that this order, sent by Houston at Gonzales on the night of March 11, was received by Fannin on the morning of the 14th. As afterwards found out, the 14th was the day that Ward's command had been engaged with the Mexicans in battle at Refugio, and in which the Texans were overpowered. Hence, the reason they had not returned to Goliad. After that engagement Ward had attempted to reach Victoria but was cut off and, without ammunition, surrendered. He with his men were returned to Goliad two days before the massacre and shared the fate of the other prisoners.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HUDSPETH. In a recent history of Texas by Hon. Louis J. Wortham, there is recorded the reason Fannin did not retreat. Wortham relates that there was one survivor who states that Fannin did not want to leave the American families there at the mercy of the Mexicans. This is the story that one of the Americans who escaped relates in this history of Texas, which I think is the best I have ever read.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In reply to the gentleman, I will say that the families in distress at Refugio was one of Fannin's reasons. King had been sent there to take them away and Ward had been sent to King's relief. Fannin could not retreat and leave these families there unprotected. Furthermore, he could not retreat until the two detachments of soldiers had returned because he would be leaving them to fall a prey to the Mexican soldiers. He was endeavoring to get them back so as to be able to retreat and take the families with him. This is what caused the delay.

Upon receipt of Houston's order, according to Yoakum, Fannin "immediately dispatched an express to Ward, stating the nature of Houston's order, and requiring him to return with all haste to Goliad." Other orders were issued preparatory to the retreat, but these fell into the hands of Urrea.

Senator Houston twice in his farewell address lauds Yoakum's history for its accuracy and completeness. In the main, it was relied upon by him to refute the scurrilous charges made against him and published in the Texas Almanac. Yoakum was a man of undoubted character and ability, and had made wonderful research in the preparation of his historical work. He was a Tennessean and the friend of Houston. On coming to Texas he lived in the same town in which Houston lived and died. He was a graduate of West Point and a lawyer of great ability.

Senator Houston's farewell address was in vindication of himself against the scurrilous charges made in the Texas Almanac. It was a notable address, in which he flayed his political adversaries as with a lash made of scorpion's tongues. But in the bitterness of the debate, 23 years after the occurrences spoken of, he could not be expected to give the same degree of accuracy to detail of facts, as characterized the work of the careful historian, Yoakum. In this Yoakum is corroborated by later historians, including Mrs. Pennybacker and others.

Doctor Bernard, who was with Fannin at Goliad, in his account says:

The alleged disobedience of Colonel Fannin to Houston's order is an undeserved censure of a gallant soldier, and that he wrote back a refusal I know to be false. Circumstances have enabled me to possess a positive knowledge on this point, and justice to both the dead and the living require me to state it.

Up to this point there seems to be a direct conflict between Houston on the one hand and Doctor Bernard and Historian Yoakum on the other. I have spent a great deal of time and effort to get at the real truth. I have reached the conclusion that the explanation is contained in Houston's letter to Collingsworth, chairman of the military committee, written from Gonzales on March 13, the day he commenced his retreat from that place. That was just two days after he had sent the order to Fannin, and he inclosed copy of the order to Collingsworth with that letter. Fannin had not then received the order, and did not receive it until the following day, according to Yoakum.

In this letter to Collingsworth, Houston, speaking of Fannin, said:

He has written letters here indicating a design to march upon San Patricio, and also the occupation of Copano. So that I am at a loss to know where my express will find him. * * * On seeing the various communications of Colonel Fannin at this point, I could not rely on any cooperation from him.

It is clear that Houston at the time of writing that letter to Collingsworth was impressed with the fact that Fannin's plans were inconsistent with his. He formed that impression from seeing the letters at Gonzales, written by Fannin himself. This impression doubtless remained with him, as Fannin did not live to clear it up. After the lapse of 23 years, in answering his critics, Houston was undoubtedly in error in assuming that Fannin's letters were written after instead of before receiving the order to retreat.

So far as known, Houston never at any time made public a letter from Fannin indicating that he would disobey the order to retreat from Goliad. Neither did he ever refer to such a letter in any official communication or report.

The continued retreat of Houston and the result at San Jacinto are too well known to warrant repetition here. It is sufficient to say that by that victory a new nation was born, which was recognized in due time by the United States, England, France, Holland, and Belgium. Resolution for recognition of independence was reported by Mr. Clay in the Senate and by Mr. Wise in the House. It was adopted March 1, 1837, the first anniversary of the assembling of the convention that adopted the declaration of independence.

In August, 1837, Gen. Memucan Hunt, Texas minister at Washington, at the instance of President Houston, made representations to the United States for the admission of Texas into the Union. Forsyth, Secretary of State, declined to consider the proposition, and in this he had the approval of President Van Buren.

In 1841 Harrison became President and appointed Webster Secretary of State. Harrison soon died, and Tyler became President. Tyler was favorable to the admission of Texas, but Webster was opposed. Webster was later succeeded by Upshur, of Virginia, who was favorable to admission. Upshur, under Tyler's advice, in 1843 arranged for a treaty with the Republic of Texas for admission to the Union as a Territory; but before this could be entered into Mr. Upshur was unfortunately killed by an explosion of a gun on the *Princeton*. Calhoun succeeded Upshur and carried out the negotiations, after making some minor alterations in the draft of the treaty.

The treaty was submitted to the Senate in 1844 and resulted in a defeat for admission by a vote of 35 to 16. Both the Senators from the States of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Louisiana and one each from the States of North Carolina, Georgia, and Missouri, all slave States, voted against admission. On the other hand, one Senator from New Hampshire and both the Senators from Pennsylvania and Illinois voted for admission. From this it might be inferred that the question of slavery was not considered the dominant issue at that time.

After the decisive defeat of annexation by the Senate in 1844, the question became the leading issue in the presidential election of that year. Clay was the nominee of the Whigs, and opposed admission. Polk was running on an admission platform.

In the book entitled "Tyler Letters and Times," by Lyon G. Tyler, son of the President, published in 1885, on page 350, volume 2, appears this language:

As the day of the election drew near the excitement over Texas grew each day more and more violent. The caldron of politics seethed nothing but Texas! Texas! Every other issue was swallowed up in the great one of annexation, which formed the subject of every speech, meeting, and conversation. Orators bawled themselves hoarse about Texas; newspapers bristled with all sorts of types proclaiming Texas. Texas clubs were all the rage, and even the poet wrestled with the name and wrote numberless verses in honor of Texas.

The election resulted in a landslide for Polk and Dallas. In the next session of the Congress the treaty was disregarded, but many bills were introduced for the admission of Texas. The discussions were full and complete, able and interesting. Slavery, of course, came in for its due share of the discussion, but additional to that, constitutional questions were involved. Then war with Mexico was seriously considered, Mexico not having acknowledged the independence of Texas, and still claiming it.

In the latter part of February, 1845, the joint resolution was adopted for the admission of Texas as a State, and by which the public domain was to remain the property of the State. This was carried by a substantial majority in the House, but in the Senate the majority was only 2, the vote being 27 to 25 in favor of annexation. The resolution was signed by President Tyler on March 1, just three days before the expiration of his term.

Texas had many friends in public life, but Mr. Tyler was not surpassed in his zeal by any. He, with Upshur, put forth the first plan for annexation by treaty. Under his direction Calhoun afterwards negotiated that treaty for presentation to the Senate. It was signed by Van Zandt and Henderson, on behalf of Texas. The election in 1844, after the defeat of the treaty in the Senate, was a vindication of President Tyler.

Texas has acknowledged the services of President Tyler and Secretaries Upshur and Calhoun, by naming a county in honor of each. I am indebted to Miss Ruth Myers, chief clerk of the attorney general's office of Texas, for information in regard to the naming of Upshur County, and for a brief biography of Mr. Upshur. I am also indebted to ex-Governor Colquitt and to Mr. J. Littleton Talley, of Goliad, for data furnished at my request.

One of the Senators who took an active interest in behalf of the admission of Texas was Senator Bagby, of Alabama. He had been Governor of Alabama and United States minister to Russia. It is of interest to note that Senator Bagby was the father of one of our most distinguished Texans, the late Gen. Arthur P. Bagby, of Lavaca County. General Bagby was educated at the University of Alabama and at West Point. He came to Texas in 1858 and served as a brigadier general in the Confederate Army during the War of Secession. At the time of his death a few years ago, he was survived by only two other generals of the Confederacy.

In recent years the people of Texas have taken steps to honor the martyrs of Goliad. The old mission, which has ever remained the property of the Catholic Church, and long in ruins, has been restored by the Knights of Columbus to what is believed to have been its former condition.

The legislature in 1883 authorized the erection of a monument in Goliad, consisting of a 33-foot marble shaft upon a granite base, and suitably inscribed. It is considered the handsomest monument in Texas, and the grounds are beautified and maintained by the ladies of the Fannin Park Association.

Through the efforts of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas a bill passed the legislature in 1913 to accept and beautify another park at the town of Fannin, where the battle and surrender took place, and to erect a suitable monument there.

The land for this park was contributed by its owner, Mrs. L. J. Hanley, and the bill in the Texas Legislature was introduced by Hon. Leopold Morris, of Victoria, who sponsored it through the house, while a like service was performed in the senate by Senator John H. Bailey, of Cuero. As a coincidence, the bill was approved by Gov. O. B. Colquitt, then Governor of Texas, a distant cousin of Senator William T. Colquitt, of Georgia, who performed an active service in behalf of Texas annexation in the United States Senate in 1844 and 1845. Also under Governor Colquitt's administration a monument was erected to Miss Joanna Troutman in the State cemetery at Austin and a bronze tablet placed there containing the names of those who perished at Goliad.

Goliad is now becoming a great shrine in Texas and is being visited by many persons of note each year. The State park at Fannin and the old mission near which the massacre took place have become the Mecca for the school children interested in the study of history. It is a common occurrence for large classes to visit these hallowed grounds. County Judge J. A. White and Mayor Joseph Wearden, of Goliad, have taken steps to beautify the grounds where the massacre took place and provide suitable roads and driveways.

At the beginning of the year 1836 Texas was the last resting place for civil liberty in Mexico. The usurper had behind him 8,000,000 people, Texas had 30,000. The martyrs of Goliad proved more powerful in death than in life. San Jacinto sealed the doom of Santa Anna. He never regained the confidence even of his own country. After death he was denied burial in the national cemetery. His remains lie at Guadalupe Hidalgo, where our treaty of peace was signed at the close of the Mexican War.

Texas fills a unique place in history. It was long claimed by both France and Spain by right of discovery. In 1763 it was ceded by France to Spain. Spain ceded it back to France in 1800. It was claimed by the United States under the Louisiana purchase from France in 1803, but all our rights were quitclaimed to Spain in 1819 in part consideration of the purchase of Florida. Texas became a part of the Mexican Empire under Iturbide in 1821 and of the Mexican Republic in 1824.

Texas became an independent republic in 1836 and a State in the American Union in 1845. In 1861 Texas seceded and shared the fate of the Southern Confederacy. From the close of the war in 1865 it was under the military rule of the United States until 1870, when, complying with the requirements of Congress, it was readmitted to statehood.

Texas has paid allegiance to the Bourbons and the Bonapartes, the Hapsburgs and the Montezumas. It has several times been a kingdom, twice an empire, and six times a republic. It has now reached its goal as a king of empires in the greatest Republic the world has ever known. [Applause.]

Notwithstanding its varied history, Texas remained practically unsettled and undeveloped until a time almost within the memory of men still living. To Stephen F. Austin, more than any other, is due the honor and credit. Austin and Houston were both born in the State of Virginia, in the same year, 1793; Austin in Wythe County, Houston in Rockbridge. Austin went to Texas from Missouri, Houston from Tennessee. Each became prominent in his respective State of adoption before going to Texas, but the crowning points in their careers were attained in the land made great by their wisdom and genius. [Applause.]

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield for one observation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. In enumerating all the wonders of Texas the gentleman forgot to mention the chief one, and that is we are going to nominate the next President of the United States down there.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I accept the amendment of the gentleman from Nebraska. [Applause.]

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 12286, the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROWBOTTOM). The gentleman from Idaho moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CHINDBLOM in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12286) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill, and read as follows:

BUREAU OF AERONAUTICS

AVIATION, NAVY

For aviation, as follows: For navigational, photographic, aerological, radio, and miscellaneous equipment, including repairs thereto, for use with aircraft built or building on June 30, 1928, \$1,250,000; for maintenance, repair, and operation of aircraft factory, air stations, fleet, and all other aviation activities, testing laboratories, for overhauling of planes, and for the purchase for aviation purposes only of special clothing, wearing apparel, and special equipment, \$9,675,000, including \$400,000 for the equipment of vessels with catapults and including not to exceed \$300,000 for the procurement of helium, of which such amounts as may be required may be transferred in advance to the Bureau of Mines; for continuing experiments and development work on all types of aircraft, including the payment of part-time or intermittent employment in the District of Columbia or elsewhere of such scientists and technicians as may be contracted for by the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, at a rate of pay not exceeding \$20 per diem for any person so employed, \$2,000,000; for drafting, clerical, inspection, and messenger service, \$725,000; for new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment, \$15,865,000, of which amount not to exceed \$9,480,000 shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred under the contract authorization for these purposes carried in the Navy

appropriation act for the fiscal year 1928, approved March 2, 1927; toward the construction of the rigid airships authorized in Public Act No. 422, Sixty-ninth Congress, approved June 24, 1926 (total limit of cost \$8,000,000), \$1,800,000, and the sum of \$200,000 of the appropriation, "Aviation, Navy, 1928," toward the construction of one of such airships is hereby made available until June 30, 1929, toward the construction of two such rigid airships: *Provided*, That the contract for such rigid airships shall (a) reserve to the Government the right of cancellation of the construction of the second airship if changed circumstances, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, shall suggest that course as being in the best interests of the Government, such right of cancellation to continue until the first airship shall have been tested in flight and accepted, and (b) provide that in the event of such cancellation the total cost of the first airship, and all payments under, and expenses incident to the cancellation of, the contract for the second airship, shall not exceed \$5,500,000; in all, \$31,315,000; and the money herein specifically appropriated for "aviation" shall be disbursed and accounted for in accordance with existing law and shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That in addition to the amount herein appropriated and specified for expenditure for new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment the Secretary of the Navy may prior to July 1, 1930, enter into contracts for the production and purchase of new airplanes and their equipment, spare parts and accessories, to an amount not in excess of \$10,000,000: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance of more than six heavier-than-air stations on the coasts of the continental United States: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of airplanes: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay out of this appropriation the amounts due on claims for damages which have occurred or may occur to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft where such claim does not exceed the sum of \$250: *Provided further*, That all claims adjusted under this authority during the fiscal year shall be reported in detail to the Congress by the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, this paragraph just read contains the reappropriation of \$200,000 and new appropriations to the extent of \$1,800,000, a total of \$2,000,000 to be applied toward the construction of one or more rigid airships.

After the bill had been reported to the House, and when general debate was proceeding on last Thursday, it came to the attention of the members of the subcommittee that one of the outstanding shipbuilding concerns in the United States, the American Brown-Boveri Electric Corporation, of Camden, N. J., was in position to offer competitive designs and estimates for bids for the construction of one or more of the type of ships to which I have referred, and that it desired to do so.

In view of the fact that the matter had not been brought to the attention of the subcommittee during the hearings, your subcommittee felt that it was due the House that we conduct something of a supplementary examination or inquiry into the report that had come to the committee.

Your subcommittee at once got into touch with the Brown-Boveri Co. and arranged for a hearing the following day to determine something of the plans this organization has in view that might have bearing upon the question.

After obtaining rather a full statement from Mr. Laurence R. Wilder, the chairman of the advisory committee on shipbuilding of the corporation, who was accompanied by Mr. E. H. Rigg, naval architect, and Mr. Charles Langell, chief estimator, outlining the responsibility of the company and the thought of those responsible officers in connection with the possible construction of a rigid airship, your subcommittee held a further hearing with the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. Wilbur, the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Warner, and with officers of the Bureau of Aeronautics, particularly with the thought of inquiring into the advisability of requiring new design competitions following the passage of the pending bill in event we shall carry money for the construction of one or more rigid airships as an alternative program, in lieu of a possible contract upon the basis of offers of designs made eight months ago.

Members of your subcommittee believe that it might be to the advantage of the Government to invite new designs to be followed by construction bids. Probably I should say that it is not at all unlikely that other large concerns that were not interested in the program of lighter-than-air craft one year ago to the extent of offering bids are now seriously considering the question.

The committee contemplated offering an amendment requiring the Secretary of the Navy to call for new designs and new bids. However, the Secretary of the Navy advised the committee frankly and fully that he concurred in the desirability of calling for new designs and bids and assured the committee that that would be the policy. With that thought we are not

offering an amendment requiring new offers to be made, as we are assured that this will be done.

Probably I should say further that if we had not had this understanding it is the opinion of your subcommittee that calls for new designs and bids would need to have been made under the law. Members of the subcommittee question the sufficiency of authority to contract for two ships upon the basis of calls for designs and bids when only one ship had been appropriated for; and hence, that there may be no uncertainty whatever, it seems to the subcommittee that the slate should be wiped clean and invitations made anew for designs and construction.

I should say that the Secretary of the Navy concurs in the general thought I have indicated, and should the bill pass carrying money for rigid airships he will undertake the problem of assembling competitive designs and estimates for construction upon the basis of a new program.

I recognize that there may be those who will feel that contracts should be entered into upon the basis of designs already made. Your subcommittee was very particular to inquire whether or not the Government had gone so far as to incur any liability and was assured that it had not. No one can be more appreciative than the members of the subcommittee, because of their knowledge of the facts, of the research and studies and expenditures incurred in connection with the preparation of designs upon the part of the successful design competitor in 1927—the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. Even so, since no obligations have been assumed by the United States, your subcommittee does not feel that it would be doing the frank and just thing by the House in omitting to bring the full facts to your consideration. We are not administering our own property; we are in the position of trustees, administering the property and affairs of a great country, and we believe that in so doing we are compelled to follow the course that we have pursued.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRENCH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to ask the gentleman in reference to the language on page 34:

Provided, That the contract for such rigid airships shall (a) reserve to the Government the right of cancellation of the construction of the second airship if changed circumstances in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy shall suggest that course as being in the best interest of the Government.

Is that in line with what the gentleman has been telling us, or does that hold back the construction of that ship?

Mr. FRENCH. That applies only to the second ship, and not the first.

Mr. LINTHICUM. We can proceed with one ship until it is completed under these provisions?

Mr. FRENCH. The right of cancellation is reserved to the Government in the construction of the second airship if in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy it shall be wise. Suppose, for instance, the first ship shall fail to function properly. There would be a good illustration. We ought not to proceed blindly with the other ship. We felt that the department ought to write into its contract a provision reserving the right of cancellation, so that there would be no question about it. Of course, there might be other contingencies that we are not able now to see that would justify cancellation.

Mr. LINTHICUM. So that the one ship will be finished and then they will proceed with the other?

Mr. FRENCH. I do not think that will be necessary. If the gentleman will read further on he will find that we have not tied it so tightly as that, but we have provided that moneys may even be expended, where economies could be obtained through the preparation of duplicate parts, for a second ship, and yet we have limited the amount. We do not want the Navy Department to go too far and too fast on the second ship until the first one shall have been demonstrated a success.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The bill also provides that the right of cancellation shall continue until the first ship is tested out and accepted.

Mr. FRENCH. That is correct.

Mr. BEGG rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho have two or three minutes more. I

want to ask some questions. I want to know something about this. I am not going to try to mess up the gentleman's bill in any way, but I would like to have some information.

Mr. BLACK of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Idaho be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield the floor for that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. It has been two years since these ships were ordered. Am I right in that?

Mr. FRENCH. The law was passed in 1926.

Mr. BUTLER. Can the gentleman tell me just when, in the gentleman's mind, we may expect to see these ships completed? Are we going to complete them at all?

Mr. FRENCH. Oh, I think so.

Mr. BUTLER. Because there is no use of our bothering over in our legislative committee unless we are going to have some results. This Goodyear Co. told us that they would build these two ships for \$8,000,000, and build a hangar along with them. They ask now for \$5,000,000 to build one, and the other to cost \$4,000,000. What are we to do about it? I am not barking for any corporation or any institution. I wish to see these two ships built, or else I would like to see Congress repeal the law, and I am perfectly willing to introduce a bill to strike out all of these hold-over provisions of law providing for the construction of ships not even begun. Does my friend propose to build a hangar? It is provided in the bill that no part of the appropriation shall be used for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of airplanes. Where will this concern that my friend speaks of build the ships? The Goodyear people offered to put up a hangar that will cost at least a million dollars and build the two ships for \$8,000,000.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, the hangar is to cost from two and a half million to three million dollars.

Mr. BUTLER. I am obliged to my friend; I had forgotten that. I do not propose to antagonize this appropriation, and I could not succeed if I wanted to do it, but we have been endeavoring on our end of the program to make a bargain by which we can save some money on these ships. These people said that they would build them for \$8,000,000 and at the same time put up a hangar. The concern of which the gentleman speaks is a very responsible one. I know of it over at Camden, N. J. It makes a fair contract, and it does fine work, but where will it build this great big balloon? It requires a big barn to build a balloon in.

Mr. FRENCH. May I answer the gentleman's inquiry now?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. I fear I have asked a pretty long question.

Mr. FRENCH. When the representatives of the department were before the committee a year ago it was contemplated at that time that if one dirigible could be built by contract, the hangar of the Government at Lakehurst would be utilized. When designs were called for and negotiations undertaken looking to a contract, the Goodyear people, the winner of the first place in the design contest, felt that it was altogether out of the question to use the Lakehurst hangar, that the expense would be such that they ought not to do it. They felt that the limit of cost of \$4,500,000 was such that it precluded the company building a hangar of its own. In trying to be safe, it appears that probably we tied the department too tightly as to limit of cost. In this bill we have raised the limit of cost on the first ship, and we recognized that since airships pertain to a new industry in this country, whatever concern will build in such a way as to win the contract will need to build a hangar or else use the Lakehurst hangar.

I do not believe that any manufacturing concern other than possibly the American Brown-Boveri Co. would be near enough to Lakehurst to make the utilization of that institution available. Even so, this company would prefer to build its own hangar. I think if the contract were to be awarded to the Goodyear people, they would need to do what the gentleman has suggested—build a shed or hangar within which to construct the ship.

Mr. BUTLER. Is the gentleman satisfied that all of the equipment that is necessary to be provided is in that hangar at Lakehurst ready to build these ships?

Mr. FRENCH. No; I am not. If the Government should build one or more of the airships, we would need to use the Philadelphia air factory as well as the Lakehurst hangar, and we would need to extend their facilities.

Mr. BUTLER. How much money will the Government have to expend in order to prepare that hangar at Lakehurst in which this ship can be built?

Mr. FRENCH. In a general way we went into that question, and we were told by the department that the rough estimates, if the Government itself were to build one of these ships, would be somewhere around \$4,500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. I will ask that the gentleman may have five minutes more. I am not quite through. Of course this is subject to a point of order.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I request that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] may have five minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] may have two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. I only asked permission to make this inquiry in order to subscribe myself among the list of those who favor what is known as "Coolidge economy." You can get these two ships down flat and plump for \$8,000,000, under bond, given by this corporation, the Goodyear Co., for performance. On top of that they will give us security to put a hangar up that will cost an enormous sum of money, so that hereafter if the Government needs additional ships of this character it will have these places in which to construct them. They are not spending any money uselessly. I would like to live to see the time when we would build these ships.

Mr. FRENCH. The calling for new designs and bids would probably have the effect of a delay for several months. I do not think it would have the effect of delaying longer.

Mr. BUTLER. These people never made any offer to our committee that I ever heard. I do not think they have ever made any suggestion at all. Nothing came to us but the offer of the Goodyear people. They give bond for the faithful performance of contracts. I think it is a good thing.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes, if I might.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes after my colleague has finished.

Mr. DYER. Those are requests that should be put separately.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put the requests separately. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to his colleague for the purpose of enabling him to make a request?

Mr. BEGG. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DAVEY] asks unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes following the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Reserving the right to object, I suppose those two speeches are both on the bill?

Mr. DAVEY. I will say that for the time being my colleague and I are agreed.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Reserving the right to object, I trust there will be no political debate, one in favor of a Democratic candidate and the other in favor of a Republican.

Mr. LOZIER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire if either of these gentlemen has in his inside pocket a letter written by the other? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DAVEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I agree wholeheartedly with my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]. I am not at all in sympathy with the idea of provoking an additional delay in the beginning of the construction of these dirigibles. Let me say that in the remarks I shall make I do not intend to be in any way unkind. But the facts are as they are, and I can not change them.

Now, as to this Swiss-American concern, this Brown-Boveri Co., I would like to call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] asked Mr. Wilder if it was an all-American concern, and in the hearings not once does Mr. Wilder deny that it is a foreign corporation. But he says repeatedly in his testimony that the Swiss concern, the Brown-Boveri Co., furnished them the patents and the engineers, and they have two members on the board of directors.

That does not mean a thing to me. I would personally, perhaps, just as willingly let a contract to an all-foreign concern;

but when it comes in the way it does, it does not at all increase my faith in the sincerity of the bidders.

This Brown-Boveri Co. was organized in 1925. The Navy Department advertised for bids and designs in 1927, two years after these people were in existence. Now, if their interference at this time, if their injection of an implied cheaper price, be worthy of attention, I call the attention of the committee to the fact that there is not in evidence anywhere a single line in writing by an authorized officer of this Swiss-American concern binding that concern to do anything for the American Government.

In 1927—last spring—the Navy Department advertised publicly for bids for design and construction of these dirigible ships. Now, there were approximately 30 bidders and designs; some institutions or companies, others individuals. The Navy Department had drawn up a scale of ratings on the basis of 100 per cent. The Goodyear Co. rated 103 on the grading of the Navy Department, and the nearest competitor to the Goodyear Co. rated 86, and the next competitor rated 77. In other words, there was a differential in favor of the Goodyear people of almost 20 points.

Now, that is to be easily understood. Let this House familiarize itself with the personnel of the Goodyear Co.; and for the information of the Navy Department and of the House I want to go on record as being opposed to a delay of six or eight more months for the purpose of giving an opportunity to a concern as to which I will say there is doubt in my mind about its good faith and the good faith of that concern's bid.

The gentleman who appeared before the committee, Mr. Wilder, has no license to make any claim to anything about a dirigible. He says they have associated with them a couple of college professors. They may be theoretical; they may be authorities in the field of engineering theory, and I will not question that. Then he refers to Captain Heinen, and he quotes him at length in the hearings, but I challenge any man living to show me a line in the biography of Captain Heinen which justifies the assumption on his part that he is any kind of an engineer in navigation. It is true he was a pilot at one time, but there is some doubt about his ability to continue as a pilot in the only real job he ever had.

Now, contrast that with the personnel of this Goodyear Co. Dr. Karl Arnstein was with the Zeppelin company in Germany as its chief engineer for 10 years. He constructed one of the first duralumin structured airplanes and was closely associated with the design, stress, analysis, and construction of the two types of metal airplane. Eugen Brunner, from 1911 to 1924, 13 years with the same Zeppelin concern in Germany in charge of design of power and passenger cars and accessories for airships, and so on. All doctors from the best engineering schools in the world. Herman Richard Liebert, from 1918 to 1924 with the same Zeppelin company in charge of experimental work, aerodynamic computation, experimental designs, and so on, now a member of the Goodyear concern. Benjamin Josef Schnitzer, from 1915 to 1924, nine years with the same concern in Germany and up until the present time with the Goodyear concern, in charge of design of hull structure, landing, handling, and mooring devices. Paul Helma, another German Zeppelin man, with experience in strength calculation on airships. Dr. Wolfgang Klemperer, from 1921 to 1924 with the same Zeppelin concern in charge of research work on wind channel and in flight; developing and testing instruments for airships and testing experimental airship parts. Lorenz Rieger, out of the same concern in Germany, in charge of design and construction of airship power plants. Eugen Schoettel, from the same concern. He spent one year in design and installation of instruments and miscellaneous apparatus; three and a half years in design, construction, and testing of new airship parts, miscellaneous projecting, and so forth, and four years in projecting department in charge of outer cover, gas bags, valves, and so on. Karl Huertrie, another man out of that company, superintendent of fabric shop, manufacturing all covers, bags, gas valves, interior equipment, and so on. Directed the inspection and testing of all textile material used on airships and supervised all work on gas-cell netting and miscellaneous rigging. Hans Keck, who had charge of control arrangements, mooring arrangements, special tools, dies, jigs, and so on. William Fischer, who spent one year on experimental work and three and a half years on projecting work. Kurt Bauch, specialist in stress analysis and strength calculation.

Now, I want to call your attention to the fact that the Goodyear Co. is in this through patriotic motives, because the president of the Goodyear concern, Mr. Litchfield, I believe, is a man who has as much vision as any man in business with whom I have ever been permitted to come in contact. Mr. Litchfield believes the dirigible will become a vehicle of commerce in the

immediate future, and I believe in the light of the developments in the rest of the world that he is justified in his belief.

Germany will put into operation between Seville, Spain, and Rio de Janeiro this year a passenger-carrying and a material-carrying ship through the air; and right now, according to information that comes to me, a Britisher by the name of Birney is in the United States undertaking to execute a contract with the American Government for 10 years to carry mail across the Atlantic in these rigid airships. Here we are in this country, and if we let this contract next week the very closest possible time we can get a ship into operation is, perhaps, 30 months.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Is the gentleman aware that unless these airships are begun within 90 days the contract is off and that the authority is gone? That is my recollection of the act of Congress—that they have to be begun before the 1st of July, 1928.

Mr. BEGG. I have the act here.

Mr. BUTLER. Is that true—that in 90 days from now these ships must be begun?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Is not the gentleman wrong in using the plural? You can not begin the second one until you have the first one.

Mr. BEGG. But we can begin the construction of airships by starting one.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman does not believe the Postmaster General or anyone connected with the administration would enter into a 10-year contract to carry mail by air to Europe with a foreign concern?

Mr. BEGG. Whether the Postmaster General enters into that contract or whether he does not, it is evidence of what the rest of the world is doing in the development of rigid airships. And while we are sitting idly by, along comes this spurious bid, made after 12 months. I ask you where were the Brown-Boveri Co. last summer when designs were called for? Why, if you are going to postpone action for another eight months in order to accommodate this company, what is to hinder some other shipbuilding company a year from now from coming in and saying, "Give us another six months; we would like to bid"? This company is taking no chances in the world, because, as I said a moment ago, there is not the scratch of a pen anywhere which will bind the Brown-Boveri Co. They are not bound to the payment of one dollar—not a dollar—and yet they are coming to Congress and trying, through irresponsible statements, to throw a monkey wrench into the machinery and hold up the construction of these rigid airships for six months and, so far as I am concerned, knowing the Goodyear Co. as I do and that company having in its employ the engineers I have mentioned, at a cost, perhaps, of a half million dollars, for a number of years, I would not permit the Navy Department to postpone the construction of these dirigibles or, at least, the construction of one of them. If they want to advertise for the other one, that is an entirely different matter.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether this man Wilder, to whom he has referred, is the same one who has been writing us and saying that he will build ships to cross the ocean in four months if we will loan him \$75,000,000?

Mr. BEGG. He is the same gentleman.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. And if it is required in the law that the airships shall be started in 90 days, I understand the Goodyear people are ready to start them, and I may say that I rather liked the list of names which the gentleman read.

Mr. BEGG. There are no better gentlemen in the world and they are ready to proceed.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I thought mine might fit in very well with theirs.

Mr. BEGG. They can start construction in one hour after the Government signs the contract.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Has the Navy Department prepared the plans and specifications?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman understand that the Goodyear proposition with their design was not submitted in accordance with the aircraft procurement law and that it would be impossible for the Secretary of the Navy to let a contract for the construction of those airships without again advertising for bids?

Mr. BEGG. No; the gentleman is entirely wrong when he makes that statement.

Mr. TABER. That is exactly the legal situation.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman is entirely wrong, and all the gentleman has to do is to call up Secretary Wilbur and Secretary Wilbur will advise the gentleman that if the legislation were passed they would sign a contract with the Goodyear Co. as soon as the details about the design were worked out.

Mr. TABER. Saturday Secretary Wilbur did not say that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DAVEY and Mr. O'CONNELL rose.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Why does not the gentleman ask the gentleman from New York the source of his information?

Mr. BEGG. I would like to first answer the statement of the gentleman from Nebraska. This same man Wilder is proposing to build a ship—not an airship, but a water ship—to cross the Atlantic, as he claims, in four days. If the dirigible proves practicable—and I am perfectly willing to admit it is an experiment and that the rest of the world is two years ahead of us—there will not be much opportunity for this four-day ship.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. For cargo.

Mr. BEGG. Two hundred tons can be carried in this six and a half million cubic foot ship.

I want now to say a word about this \$4,000,000 offer made by this Swiss-American concern.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman tell us how fast these airships travel?

Mr. BEGG. I will ask the gentleman from Idaho to answer that question. I have an idea, but I do not want to make a positive statement about it.

Mr. FRENCH. The hearings have indicated that ships of this type would be able to travel at 60 or 80 and perhaps more miles per hour.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It depends on the wind. If she gets a tail wind, you add, and if she gets a head wind, you subtract.

Mr. FRENCH. And you must remember we have not had a ship like this.

Mr. BEGG. Let me say further that it is very interesting to read the testimony of this man Wilder. He admits connection with a foreign concern, and he speaks of a Capt. Anton Heinen. This [indicating] is the Journal of the American Society of Naval Engineers, and here is what they say about the testimony of Captain Heinen on the wreck of the *Shenandoah*:

The testimony of Capt. Anton Heinen being of a very positive nature, requires on certain points equally positive refutation. While there is no disputing the fact that Captain Heinen is an expert operator of rigid airships, we have in the record his own statement to the fact that he is not an engineering expert.

Now, just a word further. The statement was made by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH] that the Lakehurst hangar would probably be too far from Goodyear for the ship to be built by the Goodyear Co. The Goodyear people can erect this ship in the Lakehurst hangar if the Government wants to surrender the use of the hangar for three years; but in their bid of \$8,000,000—and keep in mind that the Brown-Boveri Co. wants \$4,000,000 for one ship and the Goodyear will build two for \$8,000,000—they will erect a hangar that in any time of national emergency or anything of that sort would be available to the Government wherever they decide to build this ship, let it be in Ohio or anywhere else.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Wherever the Government decides?

Mr. BEGG. Wherever the Government decides it wants it to be built they will build this hangar, and the lowest estimate that has been given me by Mr. Litchfield for the cost of the hangar is \$1,500,000, and he has said, as my colleague from that particular city states, it may cost two and a half million dollars. Mr. Litchfield said further to me:

Mr. BEGG, if building two Government ships at \$8,000,000 was the end of the program in my belief, I would not think of submitting a bid, but I believe the dirigible will become the transporter of materials and men over great bodies of water just as certainly as the airplane will become the transporter of material and men over the land, and because of that belief I am willing to risk from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 of my company's money in performing the experiment with the Government.

Will we, I ask you, permit an irresponsible bidder, who had every opportunity and every chance in the world to put in a bid last year, to come in now and throw a monkey wrench into the machinery and bring about a delay of six months, or will

we speak positively to the Navy Department and direct them to proceed with the construction of one ship at the very earliest possible moment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to make a statement. While the Chair entertained a request a moment ago by the other gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DAVEY] to be recognized for 15 minutes following the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] the Chair does not desire this procedure to stand as a precedent. In the opinion of the Chair recognition is entirely in the hands of the Chair and it might prove embarrassing to the committee to have the precedent established that the time may be controlled in advance.

Without objection, the Chair will now recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DAVEY] for 15 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like first to read from the testimony of Mr. Wilder before the subcommittee. He says:

We do not believe dirigibles will be practical for North Atlantic use for the next 20 years because of weather conditions there.

Here is a man who suddenly comes into view and wants to secure a Government contract on a proposition with which he is not acquainted, comes before the subcommittee and makes the statement that he does not consider the dirigible practicable within the next 20 years. That, I think, illustrates his state of mind.

I might be frank in saying that this sudden burst of enthusiasm on the part of the concern from Camden, N. J., is in a way a surprise proposition and hard to understand. But inasmuch as the gentleman's name is Wilder, I should say perhaps the name illustrates the type and character of the proposition.

To me it seems the concern has come as an interloper. I am wondering, as my colleague has said, not only where the concern was last summer, but I am wondering where they were two and a half years ago.

At the beginning of the struggle to bring about an American development in the construction of the great and new dirigibles in the efforts for the advancement of commerce—I am wondering where they were in the winter of 1927 when competitive designs were requested and bids called for. Perhaps it may be understood by referring to the program that this particular concern is interested in, that fast-going steamships will cross the Atlantic in four days. I understand their proposition calls for the Government, through the Shipping Board, to provide the necessary money for that wonderful new enterprise of four-day transportation—the Government to provide the money at a low rate of interest to finance the concern in their enterprise. In other words, they come here primarily with a selfish proposition asking the Government to finance an enterprise dealing with fast steamships for transportation across the Atlantic.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVEY. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not know who this company is, but I have read the hearings and I do not want the gentleman to leave the impression that they want the Government to finance them.

Mr. DAVEY. I mean on the steamship proposition.

Mr. BRITTEN. I know the gentleman from Ohio wants to be fair. The gentleman ought not to leave the impression that this company desires the Government to finance the shipbuilding activities. That is not quite correct. The Brown-Boveri Co. does desire financial aid through the loan fund of the Shipping Board. That is existing law that any ship that is built right now the operator can borrow 66½ per cent on the cost from the Shipping Board.

Mr. DAVEY. To be paid back when?

Mr. BRITTEN. In the next 20 years. The Brown-Boveri Co. have requested that this 66½ per cent be increased to 75 per cent, and the Government is working along that line now.

Mr. DAVEY. I am glad to accept the gentleman's correction, but it is Government aid they want just the same.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman knows that this is no other than the New York Shipbuilding Co.?

Mr. DAVEY. It seems to me when they ask the Government to back their enterprise it is simply a promotion scheme. These people come here not at the eleventh hour but at the eleventh hour and fiftieth minute and offer not a specific proposition—they say they will build an airship for \$4,000,000. They do not say how big and they offer no design. What have they in the way of equipment? Nothing. They have no experience, no personnel; but they want to get a contract that has been developed through the labors of others.

Here is a concern in the district that I have the honor to represent, a concern that has been laboring on this proposition for many years. They have spent within the last few years

a half million dollars to prepare themselves technically and otherwise for the construction of a great dirigible airship. They have a large equipment and adequate preparations together with expert labor and experience to enable them to go ahead.

Now, this interloping concern—and that is just what it looks like to me—comes down here and offers to build a dirigible for \$4,000,000 without reference to size or anything else, and they want to use the hangar at Lakehurst belonging to the Government. In other words, they ask the Government to furnish the workshop in which to build it.

Mr. BACON. Has the gentleman read the hearings?

Mr. DAVEY. I have.

Mr. BACON. As I read them they offer to build a hangar at their own expense.

Mr. DAVEY. I do not so understand.

Mr. BACON. It is so stated in the hearings.

Mr. DAVEY. I have been told by officials of the Navy Department that their whole proposition was completely indefinite, that nobody knows what they offer to do.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVEY. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Disregarding the two companies we have under consideration just now, but assuming all things to be equal, does not the gentleman believe that with the present development of the art it would be a good thing to have the two ships built by different concerns, on different plans.

Mr. DAVEY. If we are willing to pay the excess cost of dividing the contract, that might be all right; but it has been demonstrated by calculation that there is an immense saving in building both under one head.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I realize that, but I say with the present development of the art I think it would be a good thing, always assuming that the conditions are equal.

Mr. DAVEY. Do I understand the gentleman to suggest that the experience one concern gains in the building of one dirigible should not be applicable to the building of the other dirigible?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This would be the first big dirigible that the present firm would have constructed. Therefore I believe that out of the two constructions, with the present state of the art, it would be advantageous to have different ships, assuming that the other concern has designs of its own.

Mr. DAVEY. With all due respect to the gentleman's suggestion, that has not been contemplated up to date. I would like to develop one or two more thoughts in this connection. If, as I have understood, it is the idea of this interloping concern to use the hangar at Lakehurst as their workshop, what are you going to do with the *Los Angeles* during the period of construction?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVEY. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Has the gentleman read the hearings? Does he understand that these people, when they talked about competing, stated that they would build their own hangar at Camden?

Mr. DAVEY. I have understood that their whole proposition is very indefinite.

Mr. TABER. That is what the hearings show.

Mr. DAVEY. A responsible official of the Navy told me this morning that if it is built at Lakehurst, they will have to abandon activities at Lakehurst during a considerable portion of the period and that the *Los Angeles* during that period will have to be stored some place out of the way.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman mean that this Congress ought to decide on the firm that should make this airship?

Mr. DAVEY. No. I am saying these things to indicate what seems to me to be the logic of the situation.

Mr. HARDY. Just why does the gentleman knock a concern in another State so hard, if he is not trying to force the building of a certain ship at a certain point. It seems to me that we ought to let the Navy Department decide where it will let these contracts.

Mr. DAVEY. That is perfectly all right.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman object to competitive bidding on this proposition?

Mr. DAVEY. I am not worried at all about that; but I wanted to get certain facts into the RECORD, because I have understood there is a gentleman's agreement between the committee and the Secretary of the Navy with reference to this contract and the delay involved.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We can not build ships by gentlemen's agreements.

Mr. BUTLER. We ought to know about that. No gentlemen's agreement goes in this House in a matter of that kind.

Mr. DAVEY. I meant not with reference to a contract, but with reference to further competitive bidding.

Mr. HARDY. Let me say that the only interest that this committee has is to see that there is no gentlemen's agreement between the Members from the State of Ohio and a local institution in Ohio—

Mr. DAVEY. That is all right.

Mr. HARDY. About that contract, and the only interest that this committee has is to see that this thing is left wide open to the whole United States, and that any firm in the United States can bid upon it. There is no agreement between this committee and the Secretary of the Navy. The only thought is that the Secretary of the Navy will throw the thing open to competitive bidding.

Mr. DAVEY. May I say in that connection that I would under no circumstances question the committee, because I think they have acted in good faith and they have the interest of the Government at heart. The things I have attempted to say have reference to a concern that has been sleeping for two years and a half and have come down here at almost the twelfth hour and put in an indefinite proposition, with no equipment, no experience, no personnel, and have asked the Government to delay a program that is already two years late.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVEY. Certainly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] indicated that this firm which the Navy Department was dicker-ing with had some foreign interests connected with it. Is that correct information?

Mr. DAVEY. I really do not know. I would not attempt to answer that because I do not know.

Mr. BRITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to ask a question?

Mr. DAVEY. Yes.

Mr. BRITTEN. The hearings indicate that every dollar that has gone into their Brown-Boveri Co. has been supplied in the United States.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question?

Mr. DAVEY. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Do the hearings indicate how much voting stock is given to the Brown-Boveri Co. for the use of their patent?

Mr. BRITTEN. No.

Mr. BEGG. Of course they do not show that.

Mr. TABER. Is that the fact?

Mr. BEGG. I do not know, but there are two boards of directors.

Mr. TABER. That is just speculation on the gentleman's part.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman from Ohio has had enough business experience so that he knows he is not putting his patent in for some other fellow to play with.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think it a very important matter, when we are building ships that might be used for purposes of warfare in the future, to ascertain if any foreign interests have any interest in this company that has undertaken to build them.

Mr. BRITTEN. The Brown-Boveri Co. is now building three of our first-line cruisers at the present moment. It is the New York Shipbuilding Co. I will agree with my friend from Ohio that they have never built an airship and probably never will.

Mr. BUTLER. They are building one cruiser and taken over another to finish. The Cramps failed on it, just the engines.

Mr. BEGG. I am reading the testimony of Mr. Wilder, found on page 8 of the supplemental hearings. He says:

The securities of the American Brown-Boveri Co. were entirely financed in America, and there was no money put into it by the Swiss concern.

Further on he says:

We use the name "Brown-Boveri" because of its international reputation.

Mr. TABER. Along electrical lines?

Mr. WILDER. Yes, sir. As I have said, the stock of the corporation was entirely financed in America. Now, the Swiss have two representatives on the board of directors, but both of them are American citizens.

Do not think these people are fools enough to furnish the money and let foreign interests sit on the directorate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. DAVEY. Mr. Chairman, may I have five minutes additional?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVEY. I further refer to the question propounded by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HARDY], for whom I have great respect. I would like to say this: There has already been keen competition upon this proposition. There was competition a year ago. It is not a beginning of competition at this time. We have had the competition last year. The whole country was invited to compete in the winter of 1927, everyone who was legally entitled to in the United States. It was open to anyone.

I would like to know where this concern was at that time. Why were they asleep in 1927?

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVEY. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. In letting contracts for public buildings you sometimes have only one or two bidders, but it does not necessarily follow that one bidder is going to get the contract. They readvertise.

Mr. DAVEY. The Goodyear Co. received a rating almost 20 per cent above the next highest bidder.

Mr. BEGG. There were 29 other men besides the Goodyear institution, and they were aware of the fact that the Government wanted them to bid. It seems peculiar that at this time the Swiss-American concern did not get in.

Mr. DAVEY. Who constitutes the technical staff of this concern down in Camden? What is their experience and background? One Captain Heinen—the captain part of it is a courtesy title—corresponds to an airship designer and engineer very much as an expert chauffeur corresponds to a designer of automobiles. He is an expert chauffeur, and that is all. They have absolutely no technical staff that is prepared to approach this problem. They have no equipment, no experience, no background, no preparation for it at all. They come in when the thing is all done and ask for a delay in the proceedings, so that they may get ready and think out a plan of some kind to submit in competition with the well-matured and long-developed program that has already been submitted to competition.

With that statement, gentlemen, I am glad to yield the floor, and I thank you sincerely for your patient and courteous attention. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. I know nothing of the relative merits of these two companies and, accordingly, do not address myself to that phase of our inquiry. In that regard, like most of you, I must rely upon our experts in the service who will have in charge the final determination of this matter. But I am very much interested in the early construction of these dirigibles, because I believe that our country, with all its preeminent advantages in the lighter-than-air field is likely to lag.

Something has been said in this debate to intimate that the dirigible is not a practical ship for aerial operation. We are so prone to forget history, gentlemen. Heavier-than-air planes have flown on more than one occasion from America to Europe, but many pilots have lost their lives in unsuccessful attempts to fly in heavier-than-air planes from Europe to America. Yet the fact that a dirigible has made the round-trip trans-Atlantic flight with relative ease is passed by with little thought and less comment. The British airship, the *R-34*, paid us a visit a few years ago and then returned safely to England. The *Los Angeles* was delivered to us from Germany by trans-Atlantic flight. Dirigibles have long been used in European transportation. A dirigible has flown over the North Pole, and recent press dispatches indicate that another foreign dirigible is being prepared to duplicate that feat. A dirigible has made a round trip transcontinental flight in the United States. The *Los Angeles* recently flew from New Jersey to Panama and then returned. We are so prone, I say, to question the utility and practicability of the dirigible and to forget very plain facts of history concerning it. Some of its accomplishments have not been duplicated with heavier-than-air machines.

I do not want our country to fall behind in this field of activity. There is every reason why it should forge ahead. The dirigible has a function which the airplane can not perform. I

refer to the work of scouting, or reconnaissance, especially at sea. The dirigible can go to great distances, stay in the air for long periods of time, and has the characteristic advantage of being able to hover. No other kind of ship can render some of its peculiar and helpful services.

This country is specially blessed in the lighter-than-air field by reason of the fact that a kind Providence has given it a practical monopoly of the agent and element which makes lighter-than-air operations safe and sane. I refer to our supply of helium. I do not know why the Almighty in His wisdom has vouchsafed this element to us only. I have hoped sometimes that it might be a token of a better era to come when, with this agent of offense and defense possessed by no other nation, we might be able through this superior advantage to help bring about international peace. [Applause.] Americans are not seeking wars of conquest. Conquest has never been our goal and, as long as we continue to cherish our high ideals, never will be. Perhaps ours is the opportunity for a nobler mission.

By the terms under which we received the *Los Angeles* we are limited in the use we may make of it. Though other countries, denied by nature a supply of helium, are building large dirigibles, we are without a single one which we may use as we please. Our airships other than the *Los Angeles* are small ones. But, gentlemen, it is most important that when these ships are built, and I think they should be built speedily, but correctly—they shall be so designed and their construction so superintended that we may conserve this great supply of helium, of which we have a practical monopoly. We can not afford to permit its careless or unnecessary waste.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. There have been certain inventions which have obviated very largely the necessity of the loss of helium in ordinary flight. One is the apparatus for water recovery, whereby the exhaust from the motors is condensed and a volume of water procured equal in weight to the gasoline consumed as fuel. An equilibrium in weight is thus attained, and it has obviated largely the necessity of valving helium. But in ascending to great heights and sometimes in making landings we still lose some of it by valving. We have some loss also in the leakage through various kinds of fabrics.

We shall always have the materials to build airships, but we may not always have helium. Due study should be given to methods of conserving it. I have not the technical training to enable me to speak with any authority concerning methods by which it may be conserved, but there are those who contend that there are types of construction of gas cells and the containers which hold them which will give the advantages to be derived from expansion and contraction of the gas with little or no loss of the helium used. This is an important field for study.

So, in addition to our interest in having these ships, and in having them built strongly and durably and efficiently, we have the further interest of seeing that they are constructed in such a way that we may lose as little as possible of this God-given element which is so priceless in times of peace and of war, and of which, through the beneficence of the Almighty, we have a practical world monopoly. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman and members, as a new Member of this House, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the statement of the case attempted to be made out for the Goodyear Zeppelin Co. by the two candidates for governor from the State of Ohio [Messrs. BEGG and DAVEY]. [Laughter.]

It would seem to me that when a matter of this character is before the House for its consideration, a matter that involves our national defense as well as an effort to obtain the best possible results from an expenditure of from four to eight million dollars—according to the number of dirigibles to be built—that the best interests of the country should be given

consideration rather than the best interests of a particular congressional district or a particular State. [Applause.]

I mention this fact for the reason that I have the privilege and the honor of representing the first district of New Jersey. The district which I represent has within it, at Camden, N. J., the largest and most complete shipbuilding plant in the country, known as the American Brown-Boveri Co., formerly the New York Shipbuilding Corporation.

The gentlemen from Ohio [Messrs. BEGG and DAVEY], however, have totally ignored the splendid record of achievement made by this company during the 30 years of its existence. During this time it has constructed numerous war ships and merchant vessels that have been a credit to the country. It is not exceeded by any other plant in the entire country in its capacity for high-grade work.

Notwithstanding the stability and the capacity of the plant, which has been proved by many years of exceptional service, the gentlemen from Ohio [Messrs. BEGG and DAVEY] have seen fit to refer to this well-established plant by the use of derogatory terms. They have seen fit to cast aspersions on it for no other reason than that they recognize in it a competitor of the Goodyear Zeppelin Co., which has its domicile within the State which the two gentlemen already referred to so ably represent. While I represent the district which has within it this outstanding plant, yet I do not speak for that plant merely because it happens to be in my particular district, nor do I ask that it be given any special consideration other than what will result substantially to the benefit of the country at large. I do ask, however, that if the plant located at Camden, N. J., or any other plant anywhere else in the United States, can submit to us anything that is worth while, then it is entitled to our serious thought and consideration.

This bill comes before the House after this particular matter which is now under discussion has been given very serious and thoughtful consideration by the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. The chairman of this committee [Mr. FRENCH] and his colleagues who serve with him have an established reputation in the House of a careful and conscientious consideration of all matters that come before their committee for action. We know by experience that when they make a recommendation to this House it is entitled to serious consideration by the membership of the House.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. In just a moment. I would take it that when this committee comes into this House and makes a recommendation as contained in this bill we can readily assume that they have gone into it with the same care and thought as is the case whenever they present a matter to us. I wish to remind the opponents of this recommendation of the committee that there is nothing to be gained by coming before the House using derogatory names and terms that are not justified by the facts. I have heard cases tried in court, and I have very frequently noticed that the weaker the case the more abusive the language addressed toward the opponent. In this particular case my good friend from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] has seen fit to repeatedly speak of the American Brown-Boveri Co. as the Swiss Brown-Boveri Co. He must know that there is no justification for such use of the name of this reputable American company. If I should adopt the same tactics, I could with great propriety inquire of him as to the nationality of the Goodyear Zeppelin Co. I do not know the nationality of Zeppelin. Is that Swiss or German?

Mr. BUTLER. German.

Mr. WOLVERTON. But when the opponents of this measure come before the House and urge us to defeat the recommendation of the committee merely upon the basis that the company, which is a competitor of the Goodyear Zeppelin Co., has a name which they say is Swiss, I say that does not go to the merits of the issue and has no place in a proper discussion of this important matter.

Now, what are the facts? The American Brown-Boveri Corporation is the successor of the New York Shipbuilding Corporation. The latter corporation has been in business in the city of Camden, N. J., for upwards of 30 years. The New York Shipbuilding Corporation has turned out of its yard some of the finest of the United States battleships, including the *Kansas*, *Arkansas*, *Utah*, *Oklahoma*, *Michigan*, *Colorado*, and last—although perhaps, the finest, because it points to the new and inevitable union of sea ships and ships of the air—the great airplane carrier *Saratoga*. It also constructed the cruiser *Washington* and about 40 destroyers for the United States Navy, and has two cruisers now under construction for the Government, and is building the engines for a third.

The American merchant marine has also been enriched by the labor of this yard. It built the ocean passenger and cargo

steamers *Manchuria*, *Mongolia*, *Congress*, *Governor*, 9 ships of the famous President class, 535 feet long, and 7 of the President class, 502 feet long. In addition to these, there have been numerous other ships, such as transports, colliers, oil tankers, and river and coastwise ships, making a total altogether of more than 360 ships built by this one yard. And let me remind you at this point that during the war, when our country was anxious to build ships as fast as possible—in that great emergency time—this shipbuilding plant at Camden, N. J., did what has never been done before or since in any one shipyard in the world—and that is that within the short space of 39 days from the time the keel was laid, a completed ship was sent forth for Uncle Sam and is still rendering important service.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. I do not care to interrupt the gentleman, but personally I agree with all the gentleman says. I am familiar with the New York Shipbuilding Corporation, but they sold out in 1925 to this Swiss-American concern.

Mr. WOLVERTON. My friend from Ohio, for whom I have so much respect, has said that they sold out to a Swiss-American concern. What does he mean by "sold out"? They have sold out nothing.

Mr. BEGG. If the gentleman will permit, Mr. Wilder says he bought them out.

Mr. WOLVERTON. It is true that in 1925 Mr. Wilder personally organized a corporation by the name of American Brown-Boveri Corporation, which took over the New York Shipbuilding Corporation. But I wish to inform the gentleman from Ohio that every dollar that went into the American Brown-Boveri Corporation in the purchase of the New York Shipbuilding Corporation was American capital, and its entire board of directors are native-born citizens of the United States. Furthermore, every employee of the company at the present time, with the exception of a mere handful, is a citizen of this country. The name of the company is not Swiss-American Brown-Boveri, it is American Brown-Boveri. And the term "American" is used advisedly, as can be readily seen from the statement just made as to its origin and the composition of its board of directors.

There is no more significance to be taken from the use of the term "Brown-Boveri" in connection with the name of this corporation than there is in the use of the name "Goodyear-Zeppelin," so favorably referred to by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG]. It is an indication, I assume, in both instances, of a desire on the part of both companies to inform the world that they have available the famous knowledge and experience of the two names which have been made a part of their American corporate names.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I wish to emphasize the fact that this company at Camden, N. J., is an American industry. It represents American money. There is not a dollar of foreign capital in the company. There is no justification for any insinuation to be cast upon it by any one as to its nationality. It is, as its name indicates, American; and the benefits that come from the operation of this company accrue to American citizens.

Mr. MOONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Yes.

Mr. MOONEY. Does the gentleman know of any company that has directors that do not represent stock in the company?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I do not know. I do know, however, that the directors of the American Brown-Boveri Corporation are all native-born Americans; and with your permission I will inform the House as to who constitute the board of directors. They are as follows:

William M. Flook, president; Clinton L. Bardo, vice president; M. L. Sindeband, vice president; J. E. Slater, secretary and treasurer.

Executive offices, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York City; main plant, Camden, N. J.; subsidiary plants, Boston, Mass.; Sidney, N. Y.; St. Louis, Mo.

The list of directors and their connections are as follows:

William R. Begg, counsel for Blair & Co., bankers, New York City.
George A. Burnham, president Condit Electrical Manufacturing Corporation, Boston, Mass.

Allen Curtis, of Curtis & Sanger, bankers, Boston, Mass.

William M. Flook, president of the corporation, formerly president Memphis Power & Light Co., Memphis, Tenn.

Edward N. Goodwin, of the law firm of Campbell, Harding & Goodwin, New York City.

William V. Griffin, of the Anthony-Brady Estate, New York City.

James Imbrie, president Imbrie & Co., bankers, New York City.

William F. Ingold, partner of the firm Pynchon & Co., bankers, New York City.

John J. Rudolf, of A. Iselin & Co., bankers, New York City.

Theodore G. Smith, first vice president Central Union Trust Co., New York City.

Laurence R. Wilder, formerly president of the corporation, born in Chicago, Ill.

Furthermore, reference has been made by one of the gentlemen from Ohio that the technical experts who are connected with the American Brown-Boveri Corporation in connection with the building of dirigibles are of German extraction. They refer particularly to Captain Heinen. In this connection permit me to inform the House that Captain Heinen, although a native of Germany, is now a naturalized citizen of this country. If I wished to make the same sort of argument against the Goodyear Zeppelin Co., I would emphasize the names of individuals that have been given by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bree] as the ones upon whom that company is depending for the construction of its dirigible. As I remember his pronunciation of them, they would each indicate that they were of foreign extraction. However, I do not hold that against them and only refer to it for the reason that I wish to emphasize how unfair is the argument which has been made against the American Brown-Boveri Corporation because of its having retained in its employment Captain Heinen. Captain Heinen was with the German Zeppelin Co. for more than 12 years, during which time he participated in the construction of more than 85 rigid airships. Our own Navy Department thought so highly of his technical knowledge and ability and his great experience as a pilot of rigid airships that it invited him, of its own volition, to take the position of technical supervisor in the construction of the *Shenandoah* and put him in charge of training the American Navy crew for that ship.

He is best known to Americans as the man who took command of the *Shenandoah* when she broke loose from her mooring mast at Lakehurst during a very heavy windstorm, and by magnificent airmanship saved the *Shenandoah*, and after a long and extremely dangerous struggle in the air, brought her safely back to her landing field, although her nose had been entirely ripped away when she broke loose. This is the man who is now on the staff of the American Brown-Boveri Corporation, and whose knowledge and skill are at the service of that company in its proposal to bid for construction of an American rigid dirigible airship. He has the stamp of approval of our own Government upon him.

The chairman of the committee, which will give aeronautical advice to the American Brown-Boveri Corporation, is Prof. William Hovgaard, who occupies the chair of aeronautics and marine engineering at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the foremost authority on lighter-than-air aircraft, who, I understand, is consultant of the Navy Bureau of Construction and Repair and of its Bureau of Aeronautics. The highest students at Annapolis are sent to him for a postgraduate course. I am informed that he has accepted responsibility for the design of airship for this corporation. The other expert aeronautical consultant engineer on the staff of the American Brown-Boveri Corporation is Prof. Herbert C. Sadler, professor of marine engineering and aeronautics at the University of Michigan. I call the attention of my friend from Ohio to the fact that the University of Michigan and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology both agree with me that rigid airships and ships that float in water meet very much the same conditions, and are both properly the work of shipbuilders and marine engineers.

Mr. DAVEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DAVEY. Just two questions: I would like to ask the gentleman if Mr. Wilder did not say that he did not think the dirigible would be practical for the North Atlantic use within the next 20 years, owing to weather conditions? In other words, does he believe in the dirigible or does he simply desire to halt the program in favor of the steamship?

Mr. WOLVERTON. In answer to the gentleman's question, I respectfully call his attention to the testimony given by Mr. Wilder at the hearing before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations concerning rigid airships, held on March 23, 1928. The gentleman will ascertain that no one could be more enthusiastic as to the future of this type of aircraft than Mr. Wilder. On that occasion he stated that he had sufficient faith in the future of lighter-than-air craft to consider the building of a shed at the plant of his company at Camden, N. J., at a cost of over \$700,000, and that he felt he

would be justified in building such a shed as a capital investment. He stated that if his company built one rigid airship there would be no doubt about their being called upon to build more, and that he would therefore feel warranted in the building of the necessary facilities, even at the great expense mentioned, to enable his company to go into the building of this type of ship.

In this connection I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that at no time has the Goodyear Zeppelin Co. ever indicated such faith in the future usefulness of dirigibles as to warrant the expending of any such sum of money as a capital investment. And furthermore, that the offer of the Goodyear Zeppelin Co. is not a straight contract price of \$4,000,000, as offered by the American Brown-Boveri Co. for the building of one dirigible, but a cost-plus proposition which means that the Goodyear Zeppelin Co. is experimenting at the Government's expense.

I further call the gentleman's attention to the fact that Mr. Wilder, in his testimony, called the attention of the committee to the fact that the French during the last two weeks have put on a South American service, flying from Paris to Morocco, and after a short sea trip to the east coast of South America, then flying to Buenos Aires; and in this connection he used these words:

The only way we can compete as a nation, as we see it, after this most exhaustive study lasting over two years in international transportation, is by dirigible to South America. It is too long a trip to fly by any other type of airship now in service. That is why, personally, I am so anxious to see two ships constructed at this time.

In the opinion of the American Brown-Boveri Co. officials, the building of a dirigible, a rigid airship which has a metal framework, a skeleton like a ship, is a job for shipbuilders not for balloon makers. The conditions which a rigid airship meets in flight are very much the same conditions which a ship meets under way. One floats in the air and one on the water. England knows this, and that is why the British airship, the rigid dirigible R-100 is being built by Vickers (Ltd.), famous as a builder of ships. The American Brown-Boveri Co. has a long experience in building ships, as I have just shown to you, and it has a very wide general technical staff, because it builds heavy electrical machinery as well as ships.

I further wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that favorable action upon the bill as recommended by the committee will enable the Navy Department to take advantage of a much better offer that will be submitted by the American Brown-Boveri Co. should additional bids be requested. Mr. Wilder, representing this company, definitely stated before the committee that the outside cost of the construction of one dirigible by his company would not exceed \$4,000,000, whereas the Goodyear Zeppelin Co., by Mr. Young, informed the House Naval Affairs Committee at a hearing on December 14, 1927, that the cost of one dirigible would be not less than \$4,500,000 on the cost-plus basis. It can be readily seen that there is no limit when a contract of that character is entered into.

There is no doubt that it would be far more advantageous on the part of the Government to enter into a contract on a definite cost of \$4,000,000 with a bond that would guarantee performance than to enter into a cost-plus proposition as submitted by the Goodyear Co. under date of December 3, 1927.

Mr. DAVEY. The Goodyear Co. is willing to build one ship, but they say frankly that they can build two cheaper.

Mr. WOLVERTON. But they did not submit a proposition for one ship except upon a cost-plus basis, which does not fix in a definite way the actual cost to the Government.

Mr. DAVEY. They have made that proposition to the Navy Department.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. DAVEY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. If the gentleman from Ohio could have been present and heard the testimony as it was given before the Naval Affairs Committee on December 14, 1927, by representatives of the Goodyear Co., then he would have understood how undecided the Goodyear Co. was in their desire to build an airship on a fixed-price basis. The testimony indicated that the Goodyear Co. had no experience in this connection, and there was an uncertainty as to what they could do. They wanted the Government to finance the experiment.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. Yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. As I suggested to the gentleman from Ohio, all things being equal—experience, plant, ability—it might

be better to have two firms construct these airships, each to build one, so that we could get the best out of each one.

Mr. DAVEY. At a higher cost?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I said all things being equal.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I know the record of the Camden company. I know its ability. I know the character of the workmen, men who have made a name for the company and for themselves by what they have done.

But whatever company builds these ships, I assume that a bond will be required, and I know that the plant at Camden, N. J., does not tackle anything that it can not carry through. The Government has never lost a cent through that company. As an illustration of the economical and efficient work done by this yard, permit me to remind the House that on one occasion it completed one of our large battleships at a price of over \$2,000,000 less than what a sister ship constructed at the same time in a navy yard had cost. That is an indication of the ability of this Camden company.

But I will not say anything further along this line at this particular time, as I do not wish to stir up anything more than what we have to take care of to-day. [Laughter.] It is simply to let you know the capacity and efficiency of this particular plant, because they have the highest class of workmen, the best that could be gathered. If that company has been asleep, as suggested by the gentleman from Ohio, it is the fault of the American Congress, that has let the American shipbuilding yards, like the William Cramps & Sons, of Philadelphia, sleep the sleep of death.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLVERTON. I will.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman know whether this concern that he speaks of—I know of it well—will be able to submit plans and specifications in order to obtain a contract within the next 90 days? I would not want to see one of these dirigibles lost.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I think they would be as capable of doing that as the Goodyear Co., which has never built a dirigible yet. They may have had some experience in balloons, but the New Jersey shipyard has had more experience in steel construction.

Mr. BUTLER. The statute runs against one of these ships in 90 days. I know my friend's statement is absolutely reliable, and I want to know whether or not the concern he speaks of is in a situation so that they can make a bid and submit plans within 90 days?

Mr. WOLVERTON. The company at Camden is capable of doing anything and everything that is required of it. The testimony before the Naval Affairs Committee indicated that definite plans and specifications had not been adopted as yet. The American Brown-Boveri Corporation has made a study of the design and character of the ship *R-100*, now being built in England, and considers this type of ship much more desirable than that represented by the German Zeppelin plans used by the Goodyear Zeppelin Co. I am interested in obtaining the best results obtainable for the money that will be expended, and, in this connection, remember the Camden concern gives a definite bid of \$4,000,000 for the construction of one dirigible and a saving of from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 if two should be contracted for. The judgment of the committee is sound, and should be confirmed by the action of this House. To do so will enable the Navy Department to obtain new bids that will undoubtedly prove very advantageous to the Government.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BEGG: Page 35, line 5, after the figures "\$5,500,000," insert the following: "Provided further, That the Navy Department is directed to proceed at once to enter into contract for such rigid airships with the most favorable bidder in accordance with provision of existing law."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation and is not germane to the paragraph.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard briefly on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made the statement that this is not germane. I can not see where even this is discussable, because it is right in the paragraph having to do with the direction to the Navy Department to construct. I think it is germane. I do not think it is legislation. The whole paragraph says to the Navy Department, "Let a contract to build two dirigibles." This says to do it now at the earliest possible moment. Next, if it is legislation, it is in order, be-

cause the paragraph itself is legislation, and the point of order was not raised against the paragraph. Consequently, it can not be raised against the amendment offered to the paragraph.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this is legislation imposing a specific duty on an executive officer, and it is beyond the connection of the preceding part of the paragraph and is entirely out of order in the bill.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. What specific injunction is imposed on the Navy Department that is not imposed by the paragraph?

Mr. TABER. To immediately enter into a contract.

Mr. BEGG. The paragraph imposes the responsibility of entering into a contract, does it not?

Mr. TABER. The Secretary has that under the authorization law, whenever this bill carries the appropriation.

Mr. BEGG. Then, what added injunction is there upon him?

Mr. TABER. It is to immediately enter into a contract.

Mr. BEGG. I admit that. That is all it does. It says do it to-day instead of two years from to-day.

Mr. TABER. If he immediately enters into a contract, it is to be not in accordance with existing law but in violation of existing law.

Mr. SCHAFER. And what does the gentleman mean by the word "immediately"?

Mr. BEGG. I am not surprised that the gentleman does not know what the word "immediately" means, but I will tell him this: It means at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SCHAFER. That does not mean anything.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order. The Chair thinks there can be no question that the proviso suggested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], which reads as follows:

Provided further, That the Navy Department is directed to proceed at once to enter into contract for such rigid airships with the most favorable bidder in accordance with the provision of existing law—

Is itself legislation, but it is offered as an amendment to a proviso reading as follows:

Provided, That the contract for such rigid airships shall (a) reserve to the Government the right of cancellation of the construction of the second airship if changed circumstances, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, shall suggest that course as being in the best interests of the Government, such right of cancellation to continue until the first airship shall have been tested in flight and accepted, and (b) provide that in the event of such cancellation the total cost of the first airship and all payments under and expenses incident to the cancellation of the contract for the second airship shall not exceed \$5,500,000.

The Chair would inquire whether anyone has the authorization for the building of the two airships?

Mr. BEGG. It is in Public Act 422, Sixty-ninth Congress, passed in June, 1926, which I am glad to hand to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds that paragraph 1 of section 2 of "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of operating personnel in connection therewith," approved June 24, 1926, being Public Act No. 422 of the Sixty-ninth Congress, provides as follows:

PARAGRAPH 1. Two rigid airships of a type suitable for use as adjuncts to the fleet and of approximately 6,000,000 cubic feet volume each at a total cost not to exceed \$8,000,000 for both ships, construction of one to be undertaken as soon as practicable and prior to July 1, 1928: *Provided*, That the two airships herein authorized shall be constructed in the United States: *Provided further*, That one or both of said airships shall be constructed either under contract similar to contracts covering the construction of other vessels for the Navy, or by the Navy Department, as the Secretary of the Navy may deem to be in the best interests of the Government.

It seems to the Chair that the proviso already in the bill to which no point of order has been made is clearly legislation, and goes even further than the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG], and that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] only in a very small particular, with reference to the requirement for immediate letting of contracts, differs from existing law, and in fact provides that even such letting shall be in accordance with the provision of existing law. The amendment is clearly germane to the proviso already in the bill, which was itself subject to a point of order as legislation on an appropriation bill, and the amendment does not enlarge the scope of that proviso. (Hinds' Precedents IV, 3836, 3837, 3862.) The Chair, therefore, thinks that the amendment is in order, and overrules the point of order.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I did not want to step ahead of those speaking for the amendment, but I had understood one or two were going to speak for it. I prefer to wait and hear what they have to say. Yet if they do not care to defend the amendment, I shall want to oppose it.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, the reason I did not want to ask for recognition is because I thought my colleague from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY] wanted to speak. I want to say a word in behalf of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair suggests that courtesy might lose control of the floor.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I call attention to the specific language of the amendment. It merely directs the Navy Department to proceed at once to enter into a contract with the most favorable bidders.

Now, if that is not the Ohio concern and is the New Jersey concern, all well and good; it is of no material difference to me at all. Let us assume that my good friend from New York [Mr. TABER] is correct in his statement that the design bids were not technically legal and that it would be necessary to readvertise them. There is not a thing in my amendment that will prevent that.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman admit that his amendment does not mean anything at all?

Mr. BEGG. No; I do not admit it. It is simply an intimation to the Navy Department that this House wants them to proceed at once to contract for a dirigible. If the Navy Department thinks that the right and proper thing to do is to readvertise for designs, then they have perfect authority to do that with this amendment in the bill, and there is nothing to prevent their doing that. I will read the amendment again.

Mr. BUTLER. Read it slowly.

Mr. BEGG. I will. I read:

Provided further, That the Navy Department is directed to proceed at once to enter into contract for such rigid airships with the most favorable bidder in accordance with the provisions of existing law.

If the Navy Department decides that the first step is to advertise for a new set of designs, they have the right to do that under this provision. There is no question to my mind about it. If they did otherwise they would be violating the law. This expressly says, "in accordance with the provisions of existing law."

I will say frankly that the only purpose I have in submitting this amendment is to serve notice on the Navy Department that we expect action, and do not expect to come back here next fall and find some monkey wrench thrown into the machinery.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman desires to have these airships built, as the gentleman says, at once?

Mr. BEGG. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Do you not think that June 30 of this year is pretty nearly at once?

Mr. BEGG. Certainly.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is according to law.

Mr. BEGG. Certainly. If they have not begun action at that time they have no authority to begin.

Mr. LINTHICUM. This has not passed the Senate yet.

Mr. BEGG. Then this will do no damage. The only purpose of this amendment is to let the Navy Department know whether or not this House is in earnest and wants early action on these dirigibles. It is for the House to decide.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can not now arrange to close the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I would like three minutes in opposition.

Mr. MURPHY. I want to reserve five minutes. I may not use that time.

Mr. FRENCH. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes, to be divided as follows—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that it can not be divided.

Mr. FRENCH. Then I will say, Mr. Chairman, that those who have indicated their desire for time are the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], three minutes; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MURPHY], five minutes; the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], seven minutes, and I want some time myself.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That would not give the gentleman any.

Mr. FRENCH. Then 25 minutes is suggested.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize gentlemen when they get on their feet. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in 25 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Chair to stop me in three minutes.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, we all know that our good friend from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] does not introduce an amendment which is meaningless. His record in the House will not bear out anything like that. He is too intelligent a legislator to put in an amendment which is so harmless and so meaningless as he would indicate.

The whole purpose of the authorization for these airships was experimental, and that is why the law provided for two ships and provided for the separation of the total funds authorized. That is why the original law giving authority for these two ships provided that contracts should be awarded within a certain time, to wit, July 1, 1928. The present wording of the proviso in the appropriation bill, I believe, extends the time.

But the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] would require an award to be made for both ships at once. The amendment carries the words "at once." Under the present and existing conditions the concern in Ohio is the only one in a position to bid immediately. It would be in a position to receive the contracts on two ships, to the exclusion of everyone else.

Mr. BEGG. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Suppose it is decided that they have no bids? You can not award a contract without a bid.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. If Ohio had no bid, the gentleman would not be on his feet at this time.

Mr. BEGG. They have two.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Then you get them in.

Mr. BEGG. Does the gentleman from New York want us to understand he is opposed to the construction here?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No.

Mr. BEGG. Do you want to delay it?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No. I would like to see the Ohio concern get one and another firm get the other contract, because in the present development of the art we need to experiment. We want the best that each firm can produce.

Mr. BEGG. Then let us do it right away.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Then will the gentleman amend his amendment and eliminate the plural?

Mr. BEGG. I am willing.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. If you did that, your amendment would be harmless. If you take out the plural, your amendment is innocent. But to compel the department to award the contract at once for two ships is detrimental to the proper development of lighter-than-air ships.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it so happens that I was one member of the committee that favored the building last year of one lighter-than-air ship. I now favor the building of such ships. The committee feels and we are glad to report that the Secretary of the Navy agrees with us that since we are now appropriating for two airships instead of one, that new bids should be called for, especially since no one has offered to build the one ship previously appropriated for within the limit of cost.

What are the facts? The House fixed the limit of cost for one at \$4,500,000. The Navy undertook to ask for bids on designs, and if you will read the hearings in connection with the law you will find that the Goodyear Co. did not comply with the law in that they failed to state a price for the design submitted. The purpose of the law was to require that when the design was submitted a price should be stated at which the Government might buy the design, so that the Government might have the option to buy the design if it desired to do so and ask for competitive bids thereon. They refused to sell the design or to fix any price therefor, but said in substance: "We will charge nothing for it if we are given the contract." Of course, that was not in compliance with the law and the committee, with such information before it, felt it was but fair that since we are now appropriating for two ships instead of one that bids should be again called for. The hearings disclose that another company, well financed, desires to submit a bid for one ship or both, the first ship to cost not more than \$4,000,000.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] very properly said that if this appropriation carried for 1929 to build

two airships does not itself extend the authorization, that the gentleman from Ohio should have limited his amendment to the building of one ship if he simply wishes to comply with the strict letter of the law. The language carried in the bill unquestionably authorizes the Navy Department to contract for two ships during the fiscal year 1929.

Then why should the department be required to let a contract at once involving \$4,000,000 or \$8,000,000, when time is required to prepare and submit designs? The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] could have had but one thing in mind in offering his amendment, namely, to require the Navy Department to award the contract to the company that had already submitted an acceptable design and might resubmit at once such design when bids were called for. The words at once might preclude a new bidder from preparing and submitting designs.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Do I understand it is left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy to let these contracts to the lowest bidder, or is there anything that would shut out any other people who wanted to bid?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. There is nothing in the language carried to shut out anyone from bidding, and the Secretary, under the language carried, will call for bids. Members of the committee are not unfriendly to the Goodyear Co., but felt that the House was entitled to know that in submitting their design, to which reference has been made, the law was not complied with.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. Is it not a fact that for two years those who are contemplating the building of dirigibles have had information about this matter, and is it not a fact that for more than a year definite plans have been in existence?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. In reply to the gentleman from Ohio, I will say this, that perhaps more interest has been manifested in dirigibles in the last few months than ever before, largely because two large airships are nearing completion in Great Britain and one in Germany.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes and not to be taken out of the 25 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not entertain a motion for time outside of the 25 minutes. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman permit a very brief question?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. The gentleman said my amendment should apply to only one dirigible, but that is not necessary at all, because there is a cancellation clause in your own bill which will protect the Government.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. This is a complete answer to the gentleman's statement. The legislative committee gave the Navy Department authority not only to let a contract for these ships, but authorized the Navy to build one or both ships, if it so elected; and it so happens that the testimony shows that the Navy is prepared to build one ship, and within limit of cost fixed in the last appropriation bill, to wit, \$4,500,000. Your amendment might cut off the right of the Navy Department to build—since it provides that contract for two ships must be let at once.

Mr. BEGG. But the cancellation provision in the bill would permit them to cancel the other.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BEGG. Certainly you can.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. That has been an important matter with the committee and you will note we have continued the right to cancel after the test and acceptance of the first ship. We do not desire to unduly hasten the completion of the ships. We want the benefit of whatever the art has to offer. Perhaps Mr. Wilder and his company, just now interesting themselves in the building of lighter-than-air ships may do what the Goodyear Co. has done, bring over foreign talent with experience in designing and building this type of ship, and some time must be allowed for preparing and submitting designs.

Why undue hurry? Why write into the bill something that may raise a legal question? I submit that the bill as presented by the committee protects the rights of the Government and should not be changed. It is fair to the Goodyear Co.,

and fair to every other bidder and seeks not to discriminate in favor of or against anyone.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. Will my friend put me right about the question of the statute of limitations? I do not want to go against the gentleman, as the gentleman very well knows; but what about the statute of limitations? Can we write something in here extending the statute for six months?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Unquestionably, and the gentleman can offer such an amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. That would be a change of law.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. The Chairman has just held that since this section was subject to a point of order, he will permit other amendments changing the law. I will say to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that the language carrying the appropriation for two ships clearly extends the authorization through the fiscal year 1929.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the training I have received here in the last few years has taught me to always be regular and stay with my committee. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I generally support them, but I am just a little bit confused this afternoon as I pick up this report and I see some one responsible for holding up the building of the dirigibles by this Government.

I see a telegram printed in this report, starting with the word "rumored" and signed by the chairman of this subcommittee, inviting at the eleventh hour, after two years of notice to those who build these ships that the Government is contemplating the building of such ships, and one year after we had definite and specific plans for the building of the ships, and 30 bidders had signified a desire to serve the Government, and yet on a rumor from some one, which the chairman of this subcommittee has not yet disclosed, the program for the building of the dirigibles is to be held up unless the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, carries.

I ask the gentlemen of this House to believe in the things that have been told you by that talented man from the great State of Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who knows more about dirigibles perhaps than all the rest of us put together. He told you what they could do. He told you what they have done, and yet in this report the man who is holding up and attracting and getting the attention of this great committee to the extent that they come in here with a special report of a special hearing, is a man who says that it will be 20 years before the dirigible will be practicable; yet within the last 40 minutes a gentleman who knows what he talks about tells the story of the cruises made by dirigibles; and at the eleventh hour, on a mere rumor, the chairman of this subcommittee holds a special hearing to throw sand in the machinery. This is why I am parting from you to-day.

I believe in regularity, and I am going to be regular; but I want the gentleman and his committee to tell this House why at the eleventh hour, after two years, you come in here with a special hearing and a special report to stop, if you please, the building of a dirigible.

I do not care who builds these flying machines. I do not care whether Ohio or New Jersey gets them, but Ohio is equipped at this time to go through with them. Ohio had faith in the Congress of the United States, and they prepared to do the things which the Government expected to do, and yet at the eleventh hour, on the strength of a mere rumor, the whole program is to be held up. I want the chairman of this subcommittee to tell the House where the rumor came from, who brought it to him, and what it is. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the House is now in position to make a very grave mistake and a mistake that if it be made will reflect, I think, unfortunately upon the Congress, upon its good judgment, and will indicate that there are some Members of the Congress who are willing at this time to take snap judgment and to close up a contract upon the basis of an offer of designs that was not in proper and legal form at the time when bids and designs were called for and upon bids that were invited upon the basis of one ship actually appropriated for instead of two.

The proposition which your committee brings to you is this: If the Congress shall provide money for the construction of two ships instead of one, that new bids shall be called for and new designs submitted. There may be many concerns willing to offer bids with the prospect of building two ships which last year would not compete when only one ship was in prospect.

Does any gentleman in the House say that there is anything fundamentally wrong in this? Is there any gentleman here who

is willing to assume the responsibility of saying that your Government shall enter into a contract on the basis of estimates called for and bids submitted one year ago for one ship when all your committee wants to do now is to throw the thing wide open to the citizenship of America and say that you may call now for new bids—aye, that you must call for new bids—so that everyone who offered bids before and everyone who may be in position to offer bids now may be placed on an equal footing?

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Not now. Let me mention one or two things to which reference has been made.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield for a question right on that point?

Mr. FRENCH. Not now. When I am through if I shall have the time I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. BEGG. It is a very brief question.

Mr. FRENCH. Not now. Reference has been made to the matter of citizenship of the American Brown-Boveri Electric Corporation. Their representative came before us at our request. The matter was brought to our attention through the kindness of one of the Members of the Congress, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON].

When Mr. BACON advised us that that company as long ago as last December had indicated to the department, or to Assistant Secretary Warner, of the department, that it would like to offer a bid, we felt that we could do nothing that would be so fair to this Congress and the country as to call the representatives of that company before us and ask whether or not the company is or would be prepared to offer bids.

Let me go further. Reference has been made to the citizenship of owners of the company. Your committee went into that question. We asked Mr. Wilder to advise the committee of its financial condition, the ownership of its securities, and the names of its directors. In response to a question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] as to the citizenship of the directors and officers of the organization, Mr. Wilder replied that the statement which he filed with the committee showing the affairs of the company did not indicate citizenship of his associates, but that their citizenship is 100 per cent American.

Again on page 8 of the hearings in response to a question by myself as to foreign capital being invested in this company, Mr. Wilder replied that the American Brown-Boveri Co. was entirely financed in America and there was no money put into it by the Swiss concern. But after all, the matter of citizenship and ownership of stock of concerns that may engage in Government contracts is one that by law is placed upon the administration officers. Your committee went into the question out of abundant caution, and that we might advise the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. I wish to take the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for seven minutes.

Mr. BEGG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. I shall yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. BEGG. Suppose in just a year from now some other concern as responsible as the Brown-Boveri Co. comes and wants to put in a bid, and says that they will do it for \$25,000,000 less. Would the gentleman then be in favor of postponing it six months to give them a chance?

Mr. FRENCH. If the Congress should enact a law providing for three dirigibles or four dirigibles instead of two, then most assuredly I would say new bids should be called for.

Mr. BEGG. In other words, an indefinite postponement.

Mr. FRENCH. No; the former bids were offered when one airship only was called for.

Mr. BEGG. The same thing was implied in the other bids.

Mr. FRENCH. No; not implied; it was specifically provided in the law that only one ship was appropriated for.

Now, gentlemen, what does this amendment do? The amendment of the gentleman from Ohio, if it means anything, means that you are attempting to require the Secretary of the Navy to enter into a contract to build two lighter-than-air ships now and keep out any other possible competition. The proposition is an entirely different proposition from what it would be if we were dealing as individuals with something that concerned ourselves alone.

Mr. MURPHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Let me finish. If I am about to have a suit of clothes made by Jones & Co., and this company wants to charge me \$100 for the suit that Brown & Co., tailors, are willing to make for \$75, I have a right to turn down Brown & Co. and have my suit made by the tailors who are my friends, even though I am charged \$25 more. That is my personal affair. But the Congress does not have that right when it comes to business of the Government. When one concern by

its bid is willing to build a ship at a certain figure, and another concern of equal responsibility comes in and says it would like to offer to build the same type of ship for the United States at a less figure, this Congress—trustees of this country in a sense—are not privileged to say, "You shall not bid; we like the first firm, and we are going to let it build the ship." It is our duty to call for bids and see what facts will be disclosed. Now I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MURPHY. The gentleman from Idaho wants to be fair, and he can not find any fault with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG] because his amendment does not refuse this company the right to compete with the Ohio concern. What we want is an open, fair chance with those who have had the energy and ability to prepare for this. All we want is a fair chance, and the amendment offered by my colleague does not shut out competition.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio means anything, it means the end of competition. That is all it does mean. Unless it means that, it means absolutely nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BEGG) there were 23 ayes and 78 noes.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUTLER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. Is all speech making shut off on this paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the agreement no further debate on this paragraph or any amendment thereto is in order, and there are no other amendments to the paragraph.

Mr. BUTLER. I would like to move to strike out a couple of words so that I could ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has been closed upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. ANDREW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate upon the paragraph and all amendments thereto has been closed.

Mr. BUTLER. And I voted for that, and I am not kicking against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not entertain a request for unanimous consent in violation of the agreement made by the House.

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted, I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the time was fixed by unanimous consent in committee and not by the House. Can not the same committee by unanimous consent undo a former agreement? I submit that as a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that he is not privileged to entertain a unanimous-consent request in violation of an agreement already made. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NAVAL ACADEMY

Pay, Naval Academy: Pay for professors and others, Naval Academy: Pay of professors and instructors, including one professor as librarian, \$259,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$36,500 shall be paid for masters and instructors in swordsmanship and physical training;

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My purpose in doing that is to go backward, like a crab. Do I understand that with the passage of this bill, if it should become a law, the time limit imposed by statute in which one of these dirigibles will be cut off after July 3 has been removed, and this will be in compliance with the law, and that these two ships may be built and the responsibility for the construction, whether early or late, rests entirely with the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. FRENCH. My understanding is that this language, if enacted into law, will supersede the law fixing the time limit as of July 1 next, before which one lighter-than-air ship must be begun, and that it will extend authority beyond that time for the beginning of that ship.

Mr. BUTLER. I know that my friend will not object if I repeat the question I put to one of the best authorities I have ever known, and that is whether or not the passage of this law will toll the statute of limitations, so that both of these ships may be built by the Secretary of the Navy under contract even after July 1 next.

Mr. FRENCH. That is my understanding, and there is precedent for it. Submarines, for instance, carried in the 1916 program were appropriated for and laid down after the time limit of the original act had expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Then I am satisfied with that.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Current and miscellaneous expenses, Naval Academy: For text and reference books for use of instructors; stationery, blank books and forms, models, maps, and periodicals; apparatus and materials for instruction in physical training and athletics; expenses of lectures and entertainments, not exceeding \$1,000, including pay and expenses of lecturer; chemicals, philosophical apparatus, and instruments, stores, machinery, tools, fittings, apparatus, and materials for instruction purposes, \$72,800; for purchase, binding, and repair of books for the library (to be purchased in the open market on the written order of the superintendent), \$5,000; for expenses of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, \$1,400; for contingencies for the Superintendent of the Academy, to be expended in his discretion, not exceeding \$4,000; for contingencies for the commandant of midshipmen, to be expended in his discretion, not exceeding \$1,800; in all, \$85,000, to be accounted for as one fund.

Maintenance and repairs, Naval Academy: For necessary repairs of public buildings, wharves, and walls inclosing the grounds of the Naval Academy, improvements, repairs, and fixtures; for books, periodicals, maps, models, and drawings; purchase and repair of fire engines, fire apparatus, and plants, machinery; purchase and maintenance of all horses and horse-drawn vehicles for use at the academy, including the maintenance, operation, and repair of three horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes; seeds and plants; tools and repairs of the same; stationery; furniture for Government buildings and offices at the academy, including furniture for midshipmen's rooms; coal and other fuels; candles, oil, and gas; attendance on light and power plants; cleaning and clearing up station and care of buildings; attendance on fires, lights, fire engines, fire apparatus, and plants, and telephone, telegraph, and clock systems; incidental labor; advertising, water tax, postage, telephones, telegrams, tolls, and ferrage; flags and awnings; packing boxes; fuel for heating and lighting bandmen's quarters; pay of inspectors and draftsmen; music and astronomical instruments; and for pay of employees on leave, \$1,075,000.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, the bill now being considered provides for an appropriation and expenditure during the coming fiscal year of \$369,190,737 for the maintenance of our Navy Department. Congress recently passed an Army appropriation bill calling for the expenditure of \$315,566,532 during the coming fiscal year for military purposes. Combining these appropriations, we have a grand total of \$684,757,269, which is the sum the American people will pay for naval and military purposes during the coming fiscal year; a sum grossly excessive and obviously wasteful. With this sum we could construct flood-control and flood-prevention works that would protect the basins of practically every river in the United States from destructive overflows.

Since the inauguration of President Harding, including sums voted for 1929, approximately \$3,000,000,000 have been expended on our Navy Department, or on an average of \$1,000,000 each day. In the same period we have expended about \$3,000,000,000 on our War Department, or approximately \$1,000,000 per day. And in the aggregate our expenditures for military and naval purposes during the Harding-Coolidge administrations have been at the rate of about \$2,000,000 per day. I can not escape the conviction that we are spending entirely too much money on naval and military affairs. The five or six billion dollars expended for military and naval activities would have brought far better and more permanent results if such expenditures had been for internal improvements, for development of our rivers and harbors, for highways, for public buildings, for farm relief, and for flood control.

If I had my way, instead of spending this \$684,000,000 for naval and military purposes, I would spend the major part of this enormous sum to finance the rehabilitation of agriculture and for the construction of works for the control and prevention of ruinous floods in all the principal river basins in the United States. That would be an investment that would return immense dividends in reclaimed lands, happy homes, prosperous people, improved social conditions, thriving cities and villages; and which would tremendously increase our national wealth.

It is shortsighted policy to spend nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars annually on naval and military affairs while destructive floods ravish our fairest and most productive valleys and carry poverty and desolation into a million homes. It is a stupid policy to sit complacently and allow millions of dollars worth of property to be swept away by these periodical and rapidly recurring floods. It is supreme folly for us to permit ruthless floods to run wild and transform our richest agricultural lands into a trackless wilderness and pestilential swamp. Why not spend less money on battleships and military and naval armaments and more on the conservation of our

natural resources and in the protection of our people from the destructive forces of nature?

The people of the Middle West, irrespective of their political affiliations, are vitally interested in the immediate adoption of a comprehensive program by the Federal Government for the control and prevention of destructive floods in the valleys of the Mississippi River and its tributaries. Largely in the last two generations the rich basins of the Mississippi and its tributaries have been reclaimed from swamp and wilderness, developed, and brought to a marvelous state of productivity. Men of brawn, brains, courage, and vision went into these uninviting regions, felled the forests, built highways, constructed levees and drainage ditches, and reared cities, villages, and attractive farm homes, transforming swamp and wilderness into one of the most highly productive, desirable, progressive, and valuable agricultural areas in the world.

This amazing transition from wilderness to gardens, orchards, and highly cultivated fields was not accomplished by the waving of a magic wand over pestilential swamp and unproductive waste, but by unremitting toil, persevering patience, and years of tireless industry and sacrificial efforts. Having unbounded confidence in the future of this potentially rich region, the landowners uncomplainingly assumed an exceedingly heavy burden of taxation, looking to the future for reimbursement. They mortgaged their lands to build homes and other improvements, to hasten the development of this fertile district, and to transform it from quagmire, bog, fen, and marsh into a region of unrivaled beauty and productivity.

The courage of the people of southeast Missouri in their long fight against destructive floods has seldom been equaled and never surpassed in the long line of events that have marked the struggle of man to overcome the hostile and adverse forces of nature. Year after year ruinous floods swept down from mountains, valleys, uplands, and plains of the West, North, and East, destroying crops, livestock, levees, fences, buildings, roads, and farm property of every description. Year after year 31 States dumped their destructive flood waters into the lower basins of the Mississippi and its tributaries. Year after year 41 per cent of the area of the United States drained its surplus flood waters into the narrow neck of the Mississippi between Cape Girardeau, Mo., and the Gulf of Mexico, destroying levees and millions of dollars' worth of property and driving into bankruptcy hundreds of thousands of landowners along the Mississippi and its tributary streams.

While many other counties in Missouri suffered almost incalculable damages from flood waters, these periodical disasters fell with excessive violence on the landowners of nine southeast Missouri counties, namely, Butler, Cape Girardeau, Dunklin, Mississippi, New Madrid, Pemiscot, Ripley, Scott, and Stoddard. In the 1927 flood, according to the Mississippi River Flood Control Association, the total damage in these nine counties was \$7,691,265.

In Butler County 258 buildings were destroyed or seriously damaged, the total loss in that county being \$271,300.

In Cape Girardeau County the damage was comparatively small, being estimated at \$36,500.

In Dunklin County 479 houses, stores, gins, barns, and other buildings were destroyed or seriously damaged, the total property damage in that county having reached the enormous sum of \$3,078,910.

In Mississippi County 410 buildings were destroyed or substantially damaged, the total property damage in that county being \$515,500.

In New Madrid County 1,294 buildings were destroyed or seriously damaged, and the total property loss in that county was \$802,078.

In Pemiscot County many houses, stores, barns, gins, and other buildings were destroyed or seriously damaged, and the loss in that county was fixed at \$258,875.

In Ripley County the damage was confined largely to loss of rents on lands not cultivated by reason of overflow and to injuries to growing crops. In this county the loss was comparatively small, being estimated at \$20,000.

In Scott County the property damage amounted to \$254,650.

In Stoddard County the property damage was \$1,985,350, or approximately \$2,000,000.

In the nine southeast Missouri counties I have mentioned, 310,000 acres of highly productive farming land were flooded and farm property of every kind and character completely destroyed or substantially damaged.

My colleague from Missouri [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who ably represents the fourteenth district in Congress, informs me that these statistics are very conservative and do not overestimate the loss and damage that came to these nine southeast Missouri counties as a result of the 1927 flood.

As Mr. FULBRIGHT has first-hand information as to local conditions and has made a special study of the problem of flood control and flood prevention, particularly with reference to southeast Missouri, and as he is an aggressive champion of flood-control legislation and has labored tirelessly to awaken Congress to a realization of the importance of flood-control legislation by the Federal Government, I feel absolutely safe in accepting his conclusions as to conditions in southeast Missouri and as to the character of legislation that will be most beneficial to the people of southeast Missouri.

In this connection, I desire to say in passing that while my colleague from the thirteenth Missouri district, Mr. WILLIAMS, is serving his first term, I have found him well informed in reference to all legislative problems, and especially familiar with conditions in southeast Missouri as they relate to flood control legislation. He and his colleague from the fourteenth district are supporting that brand of flood prevention legislation that will bring the best results to the people of their respective districts. I cheerfully acknowledge my obligation to them for the first-hand information as to the conditions in southeast Missouri, and as to the plan of flood control that will best protect the interests of that rich yet flood-ridden portion of our State.

Now, since the development of southeast Missouri began floods from the great Mississippi watershed have periodically ravished southeast Missouri, leaving desolation in their paths. But with commendable courage and fortitude, these stricken people, after each flood, returned to their ruined homes and "commenced life over again." They have done everything that is humanly possible for them to do to win this fight against the flood waters from 31 States. They have taxed themselves unmercifully to protect themselves from the deluge that the people of 31 States are periodically dumping on them.

The people in the Delta of the Mississippi and tributary streams between Cape Girardeau and the Gulf of Mexico, in their battle against these calamitous visitations of outlaw floods, have expended approximately \$300,000,000 in building levees and other flood-control works. Is this not convincing evidence of their courage, confidence, and good faith?

As a result of one ruinous overflow quickly following another, the resources of the people of southeast Missouri have been practically exhausted. Their present capacity to pay has been almost if not completely destroyed, the great flood of 1927 having wiped out the earnings which these people had been a lifetime in accumulating.

The victims of repeated overflows, the people of southeast Missouri are standing with their backs to the wall, desperately fighting to save a little "nest egg" out of the wreck of their former fortunes. They are the victims of conditions over which they have had no control and for which they are not responsible, but which the United States Government could and should have avoided by the enactment of a comprehensive legislative program for the control and prevention of destructive floods.

One of the most important questions before Congress and the American people is whether or not the Federal Government will continue to stand idly by and permit 31 States to dump their uncontrolled, unharnessed, and destructive flood waters on southeast Missouri and similar areas along the lower Mississippi.

Flood control and flood prevention are national, not State or local problems. The burden of preventing these periodical disasters is a load that should properly be borne by the Federal Government, and no part of it should be imposed on the States, counties, local communities, or landowners. I am opposed to all flood control bills that require the States, counties, local communities, or landowners to bear any part of the expense incident to the control of these outlaw floods that the Federal Government has heretofore negligently and unwisely permitted to run at large, unharnessed, unrestrained, and uncontrolled, to the enormous destruction of property and wastage of individual and national wealth.

The people of southeast Missouri, because of the tremendous tax burdens assumed by them in order to reclaim and develop this fertile region, and as a result of successive destructive overflows, are not now financially able to assume any part of the expense necessary to carry out this flood-control program, and there is no sound reason why the State of Missouri, the counties, the cities, the drainage districts, or landowners should bear any part of this burden.

Indeed the landowners in many of the drainage and levee districts in southeast Missouri have suffered so seriously as a result of recurring and ruinous floods, that they are not financially able to pay their drainage and general taxes or meet the interest on their farm indebtedness. Unless the National Government does its duty and does it quickly, the several

hundred thousand landowners in this vast region will be broken on the rocks of insolvency and face financial ruin.

Moreover, I believe that any flood control bill Congress enacts, should carry a definite provision for the early protection from the flood waters of tributary streams. In some of the counties in southeast Missouri and other portions of that State, much of the damage results from overflows from tributary streams, caused often by backwater from the Mississippi, or because the flood stage in the Mississippi is so high that these tributary streams can not speedily discharge their flood waters into the Mississippi. Several counties in southeast Missouri are vitally interested in having the flood-control legislation definitely provide, either now or in the near future, for protection from floods from tributary streams, in addition to affording protection from the flood waters of the Mississippi. From a careful examination of this question I am convinced that the people of these counties, and other counties similarly affected, are entitled to protection from floods from these tributary streams, and provision to that effect should be incorporated in any flood control bill enacted by Congress.

By this I mean, that the valleys of the Missouri, Grand, Chariton, Osage, Gasconade, St. Francis, Black, and other tributaries of the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers should be included in a comprehensive flood-prevention program of the United States Government, and these smaller basins ultimately protected from destructive overflows. The people in the valleys of the Grand and Chariton Rivers in the district I have the honor to represent, have for years suffered serious damages and many of them are now facing bankruptcy because of periodical overflows from these turbulent streams. Sooner or later the American people will awaken to a realization of the economic waste that annually results from ruthless overflow water from wild, unharnessed streams, and adopt methods that will arrest this needless destruction of individual and national wealth. Why longer delay this important task? Let's go. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the question of the Naval Academy merely to express a few views in reference to that great institution. It was my pleasure during the last year to serve on the Board of Visitors with Senator HOWELL, of Nebraska, and Senator TRAMMELL, of Florida, Members of the Senate, and as Members of this House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ACKERMAN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUAYLE], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL]; Senator TRAMMELL, of Florida, was made chairman, but owing to illness was not able to remain. We also had on the board Capt. William B. Franklin, a graduate of the academy; Stephen G. Goldthwaite; Ogden Reid, a great business man, a son of the late Whitelaw Reid; Harry H. Williams; and last but not least that great railroad president, Daniel Willard, of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. These men attended those sessions and visited every part of that great institution.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Mr. LINTHICUM. Certainly.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I do not know whether the gentleman was at the meeting of the board when we signed that report. But the gentleman will remember that when I signed the report I especially reserved the right of further investigating the need of five cadets from each district.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not know what reservation the gentleman from Iowa made. How does the gentleman from Iowa know that I am going to speak on the question of five cadets?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I know the gentleman had some object in reading the names of the visitors there, among which was my own.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I desired to read the gentleman's name because of his well-known ability and judgment, and besides he has great influence in this House [applause]; and in signing this report which recommends five students for the Naval Academy I took it as his best conclusion on this proposition.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The only object I had in interrupting the gentleman was to remind him of what I said on the occasion of signing the report.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will not go further into that. The gentleman will agree with me that we made an exhaustive examination of the institution.

The Board of Visitors, consisting, as I have said, of men familiar with Army and Navy matters, men of distinction in the business and professional world, Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives in close touch with legislation regarding governmental activities, made an exhaustive examination of conditions at the Naval Academy.

As a preamble to our report we have taken from the annual register that for which the Naval Academy stands, to wit:

THE MISSION

To mold the material received into educated gentlemen, thoroughly indoctrinated with honor, uprightness, and truth, with practical rather than academic minds, with thorough loyalty to country, with a groundwork of educational fundamentals upon which experience afloat may build the finished naval officer, capable of upholding, whenever and wherever may be necessary, the honor of the United States, and withal giving due consideration that healthy minds in healthy bodies are necessities for the fulfillment of the individual missions of the graduates; * * *

We find the Naval Academy is efficiently performing the functions for which it was established and which it has been successfully performing for the past 80 years. The main object of the Naval Academy is to provide young men with an education which will fit them to become skillful, efficient, and worthy officers of the United States Navy. There must be certain readjustments which are being made, due to additional work of technical character, which the academy has been compelled to take up in recent years because of great inventions such as the submarine, aviation, radio, fire control, and so forth.

The board gave a very lengthy discussion and much consideration to the question of the number of students to be appointed to the institution. The report of the committee reads as follows:

NUMBER OF APPOINTMENTS

At the present time there is an attendance of midshipmen at the Naval Academy of about 1,600. The plant is sufficiently large and complete to take care of 2,400 men with only a relatively small increased expenditure for instructors and salaries of midshipmen. Since an increased attendance would enable more careful selection of final graduates, and such for whom vacancies in the line or staff of the Navy did not exist and who would be returned to civil life would form a valuable addition to the Navy in time of need, it would seem the part of wisdom that annual appropriations should be made sufficient to maintain the regiment of midshipmen at the maximum now provided by law, the status of each graduate to be that of a temporary ensign until after a two years' satisfactory service at sea, when a permanent commission shall be issued.

If you will compare this recommendation of the Board of Visitors with the report accompanying this bill, H. R. 12286, on page 7 of the report, you will find that the committee refers to the number of students at the academy as "potential total," which it says approximates 1,710, whereas, in fact, there are not 1,710 students at the academy, but only about 1,600, because of various reasons, such as the nonappointment of students by certain Members of the House and Senate, and of resignations, and so forth, so that while giving us an additional appointment at the expense of \$255,990 in this bill, which when in full operation would be \$519,167, which is supposed to give a student body of 2,112, which is also "potential," we shall in fact have only a student body of about 2,000 midshipmen.

I shall not at this time introduce an amendment to increase the number to five for each Member of Congress, including Delegates, but I am thoroughly of the opinion and in hearty accord with the recommendation of the Board of Visitors that we should have that number at all times. This would probably amount to about the capacity of the school, which is 2,400, and for which adequate provision has been made as to buildings and equipment.

This number of 2,400, or 5 to each Member of Congress, including delegates, would give a larger number from which to select those necessary to man our ships. I am of the opinion that it will require all the graduates when our full naval program has been evolved. The committee itself admits the fact that even with this full quota we will not be able to provide for the Navy and the aviation section thereof, but that men must be secured from other schools in order that we may fill our aviation quota. The question I wish to have answered is why should we take men from other schools when here is this great institution belonging to the National Government splendidly equipped and manned to provide the large number of graduates we require? Even though we should graduate more students than there are places available for them, will they not be of great benefit as a reserve force in the event of war? Will they not also be trained in governmental matters which will make them better citizens and better able to cope with the business world as well as disciplined upstanding men of their communities?

This Government of ours stands firmly for the education of its citizens, and I know of no way by which we can spend money to better advantage than the education of students in

the two great governmental schools, the Naval Academy at Annapolis and the Military Academy at West Point. They should at all times be utilized to their full capacity. I sincerely trust that the committee will see proper in the next appropriation bill to provide the five appointments each as recommended by the Board of Visitors. [Applause.]

NEW AUDITORIUM

There is now no suitable auditorium where the entire regiment of midshipmen can be assembled. It seems most advisable that a building should be erected capable of seating the entire student body.

While at Annapolis the board was particularly impressed with the fact that there was no suitable auditorium of sufficient capacity to accommodate all the student body. This the board thought unfortunate, because it is on many occasions advantageous to have the entire regiment of midshipmen present.

NEW BOATHOUSE

The boathouse, which has been in use for over 30 years, is inadequate, unsafe, insanitary, and is too great a fire risk for a building containing so much valuable equipment. It is not in keeping with the very fine buildings which compose the rest of the academy. We indorse the recommendation of previous boards that a suitable boathouse be built.

We were much interested in the unsightly antiquity and insecure conditions of the boathouse. This does not compare with anything on the academy grounds, either in looks or accommodations; it is merely an old frame structure, or if my recollection serves me correctly, I think it is composed of two old structures. If it should catch fire, I do not see how the valuable equipment consisting of thousands of dollars worth of property could possibly be saved; certainly not without great dexterity and risk of life. Of all the things which should receive our attention as to building, certainly this boathouse is the most important.

I sincerely trust this committee will grant us the opportunity to correct this situation by appropriating a sufficient sum to construct a substantial, sightly, and adequate boathouse in which to store this valuable equipment. [Applause.]

REBUILDING SEA WALL

We also recommend the rebuilding of the sea wall alongside the power plant and shop building, as the original sea wall has almost entirely disappeared and the buildings are in imminent danger. This project is urgent and necessary.

The reconstruction of the sea wall mentioned, it seems to me is of urgent necessity; it is much cheaper to do this than to risk injury to the power plant and shop building at this location.

I know of no better language to express our approval of the administration of the Naval Academy and of the general satisfaction which we found to exist than that used by the Board of Governors, as follows:

GENERAL COMMENT

The board desires to commend Rear Admiral L. M. Nulton and his able staff of assistants for the highly satisfactory manner in which the affairs of the Naval Academy are being conducted. We also desire to comment on the excellent appearance of the regiment of midshipmen, their neatness, smartness, bearing, and morale, which reflect great honor upon all the officers attached to the academy.

The board desires to express its hearty thanks to its secretary, Commander Edwin A. Wolleson, United States Navy, and to its assistant secretary, Commander Clyde G. West, United States Navy, who were most courteous and efficient in assisting the board in its work.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired.

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GAMBRILL: Page 37, after line 25, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md.: Construction of boathouse, \$250,000."

Mr. GAMBRILL. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am going to take only a few minutes of your time for the purpose of appealing for your very earnest consideration of this amendment which I have offered. The amendment is designed to provide a suitable and adequate boathouse for the use of the midshipmen at Annapolis in order to take the place of two old sheds which have been used for that purpose for 32

years past and which have served the purpose of a boathouse, but very inadequately so.

The Secretary of the Navy has informed the Committee on Appropriations that it would be useless to attempt any repairs to the present sheds, which are of wooden construction, and which are, of course, not in keeping or harmony with the fine, imposing buildings at the Naval Academy.

May I conclude my very few remarks by saying that the Board of Visitors in 1927 made this comment regarding the boathouse, which sums up this situation very adequately:

The boathouse, which has been in use for over 30 years, is inadequate, unsafe, insanitary, and is too great fire risk for a building containing so much valuable equipment. It is not in keeping with the very fine buildings which compose the rest of the academy. We indorse the recommendation of previous boards that a suitable boathouse be built.

I hope that my amendment will receive the support of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MARINE CORPS

PAY, MARINE CORPS

Pay of officers, active list: For pay and allowances prescribed by law for all officers on the active list—pay and allowances, \$3,618,043; subsistence allowance, \$486,618; rental allowance, \$658,246; in all, \$4,762,907.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am simply making this motion for the purpose of trying to obtain a little information. After a very large force was sent to Nicaragua in the fall of 1926, I wrote the Secretary of the Navy asking what additional expense would be involved. I received from the Secretary, for whom I have high personal regard, a letter in which he said:

Referring to the expense to which this Government is put on the coast and in the territory of Nicaragua, there is no added monetary expense because of the present employment of these naval forces, since the cost of their pay and provisions is already a fixed charge, and the amount of fuel consumed is probably about the same as would be used in the usual activities of the ships in cruising and training.

I thought he must be mistaken, because he mentioned in his letter that we had 13 vessels in the waters of Nicaragua, with 176 officers and 2,272 men. Of course, I understood that during the administration of Mr. Wilson, the administration of Mr. Harding, and the administration of Mr. Coolidge, up to the fall of 1926, there was very little expense due to our activities in Nicaragua, because the marines deemed necessary to maintain tranquil conditions there were only a very small number—I think never exceeding 200—but I could not but believe that the Secretary was in error in telling me that the large expedition of 1926 would not necessitate an unusual expenditure.

I find in the appropriation act of last December an item of \$1,818,000 covering various items, one being the expenses of our activities in Nicaragua. I have been trying to ascertain what part of that total pertained to Nicaragua and what, if I can find out, it has really cost and is costing to conduct the Nicaraguan business; and if my friend the gentleman from Idaho, chairman of the subcommittee, can give me any information, I would like to have it.

I may say this: Nobody is going to put me in the position of denying that it is proper for our Government to protect American life and property whenever it is in actual peril, but I have not been able to find that any American resident of Nicaragua has been killed or injured.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. ROMJUE. I agree with what the gentleman has just said. I have made an inquiry myself and have never been able to find anybody who can report definitely any civilian American who has been killed in Nicaragua.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Have you found how many of our marines have been killed and injured?

Mr. ROMJUE. I made that inquiry of the department and am informed that 21 marines have been killed and 44 have been wounded.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. In action?

Mr. ROMJUE. Yes; and in addition to the 21 killed and 44 injured in action, 10 others have been killed through accidents for which the war was not responsible.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. To clarify what the gentleman from Missouri has just said, the 10 who were killed not as a result of

combat were accidental deaths and not caused by natives of Nicaragua.

Mr. ROMJUE. No. They were accidental deaths, but there were 21 killed in combat and 44 injured.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I ascertained, when I was making some investigation early last year, that certain corporations, several of them engaged in the lumber business in Nicaragua, were appealing for protection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. But not only have I not found that the life of any American civilian has been taken or endangered, but I have not found that there has been any such injury to property as we were told was imminent when the large expeditionary force was organized. Without any partisan feeling in this matter at all and with no purpose to criticize unfairly the administration, I have never ceased to regret that some sort of reason was found by the State Department for sending such a force to Nicaragua as Mr. Wilson, Mr. Harding, and Mr. Coolidge, up to a certain time, apparently never dreamed it was necessary to employ.

Now, the inquiry I am making of my friend is with reference to the expenditure to which our Government has been subjected on account of that course having been taken. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the question that the gentleman asks as to the amount of added expenditures on account of the service of the marines in Nicaragua is one that your subcommittee is not able to answer at this time. A little later on we shall have the information. It was some months ago when the general supply bill for 1929 for the Navy was considered by the Bureau of the Budget, and at that time the situation was so uncertain that it was deemed desirable that all extra expenditures incurred be included in the next deficiency bill. That bill will follow along later in the session.

However, in response to a question that I asked along the general line, of probable deficiencies for 1928, page 962 of the hearings, we were advised by General McCawley, of the Marine Corps, as follows:

At the present time our books show a probable deficiency of about \$2,750,000 in this year's appropriation.

That, of course, includes deficiencies for various purposes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Can the gentleman tell us how much of this amount must be charged to Nicaraguan service?

Mr. FRENCH. No; not at this time, though I have no doubt at all that to some extent there will be unlooked-for expenditures incurred by reason of all expeditionary forces. Ships must be used. To some extent additional equipment must be used. To some extent additional expenses must be incurred more than would occur with conditions running normally at the bases where the marine organizations would normally be stationed. I am sorry I must ask that further information be deferred until the deficiency committee may have the opportunity of going into the question.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pro forma amendment is exhausted.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the figures "\$4,762,907" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,672,000."

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], in his usual pleasant and honest manner, gave us the reason why he could not furnish the information requested by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Moore]. I feared for a while that the gentleman would say that for strategic and war reasons it would be incompatible with the public interest to give the information at this time. [Laughter.]

The fact remains, Mr. Chairman, that we have 3,500 armed marines down in Nicaragua; and while one can juggle and conceal figures in appropriations and put them in the regular supply bill or put them in the first or second deficiency bill, yet this expeditionary force down in Nicaragua is costing the people of the United States from \$50,000 to \$70,000 or \$100,000 a day. We do not require an expert from the Navy Department or War Department to inform Congress it costs money to keep an army in the field. The lines of communication that must be established, the cost of local supplies, the quartering of troops,

the transportation of troops within the zone of occupied territory, or whatever you may call it, cost money.

It was suggested a few days ago that the United States is down there at the invitation of the "good people" of Nicaragua. Yet the Congress of Nicaragua voted only a few days ago against any interference on the part of the United States in the control or supervision of their elections; and as Will Rogers says in his typical and certain fashion, the vote of the Congress does not count because the United States did not supervise that vote. [Laughter.]

I submit, gentlemen, that supervising this election no matter how it turns out will bring with it the necessity of keeping troops down there to carry out the results of the election. This is the weakness of the supervision.

It has been said in the course of the discussion on the floor of the House that all factions were agreed. If all factions are agreed, then I ask, in the name of common sense, why do we keep 3,500 troops down there? It is stated that one Sandino is protesting and that it is necessary to watch him. Well, he must be some man if it takes 3,500 marines to chase him and not be able to catch him when one reporter of the Nation went there and had an interview with him. [Laughter.]

Mr. ABERNETHY. Are they going to let Sandino vote when he comes to the polls?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I wonder. He will have about as much chance of voting as a colored man in the gentleman's State. [Laughter.]

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Some of them vote in our State—those who are educated. How do they handle it in New York?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. We let them vote. I wish I had more of them in my district.

Mr. ABERNETHY. You can have all who are not educated in your district. I will turn some of mine over to the gentleman if he wants them. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I know there is no use of seeking to place a limitation on this appropriation. It is the honest belief of a good many Members that the presence of United States troops is necessary in Nicaragua. Only time will tell. But, Mr. Chairman, I say that what this Congress ought to do is to take the ideals and the pledges and the promises made by Charles E. Hughes at the Pan American Conference in Habana and translate them into legislation by recalling the troops we have in Nicaragua. [Applause.]

It seems paradoxical and inconsistent that to one part of Central America we send our diplomats who express ideals and offer expressions of friendship with assurances of noninterference in local matters to the people of Central America, while another department of the Government has its armed troops in a friendly sister republic.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay and allowances of the Marine Corps Reserve, (a) excluding transferred and assigned men, \$150,000; (b) transferred men, \$243,532; (c) assigned men, \$87,500; in all, \$481,032.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 39, line 9, strike out the figures "\$87,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$65,000."

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the figures I insert represent the action taken by the committee. Somehow in preparing the bill for printing the figures of the Budget draft were used instead of the committee figures. We are carrying for assigned men \$65,000, which will take care of 2,600 men.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct all totals in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct all totals in the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, \$8,370,000, to be accounted for as one fund.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARE: Page 43, line 14, after the word "Fund," strike out the period, insert a semicolon, and add the follow-

ing: "Provided, That none of such amount shall be used in transporting troops or marines to and from marine barracks and other points except by the cheapest and most direct route."

Mr. FRENCH. I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of affording some information to inquiries that were made a few moments ago relative to the unnecessary expense incurred in transporting troops to Nicaragua and other places, and with the hope of eliminating such an unnecessary waste of money. I have been advised that there is a growing practice in the Navy Department in recent years that, instead of transporting troops from the marine barracks at Parris Island, S. C., to other marine barracks by the customary method of Government transports or ships, they use the railroads to a much greater extent than formerly.

I am advised that a few weeks ago, when troops were being sent to Nicaragua that, instead of the Government transport stopping at the marine barracks at Parris Island, S. C., where there is one of the greatest natural harbors on the Atlantic coast, 700 or more marines were picked up from the marine barracks at this place and put on the railroad, carried around 100 miles or more, and then placed on a Government transport at a cost of \$3 apiece, when, as a matter of fact, the transports following the Atlantic coast almost every day could have stopped at these barracks and picked them up and carried them wherever they were destined to go at a saving of approximately \$2,000.

My understanding is that for the past two years not a soldier, not a marine, has been picked up and carried away or brought in to these barracks by a Government transport. They have all been transported by rail at an additional cost and expense to the Government.

The only reason that has been assigned as to why these transports do not stop at this point is that a few years ago it is alleged a Government transport got a little mud in the condenser. Yet, as I have already said, this is one of the greatest natural harbors on the Atlantic coast, or in the world, for that matter. It has a bar 600 yards wide, and the harbor adjoining Parris Island can accommodate not only the Navy of the United States but in addition can accommodate the combined navies of the earth and have room enough left for a submarine base.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What is the name of this port?

Mr. HARE. Port Royal Harbor, into which the first vessel sailed that landed white men in this country.

Mr. BUTLER. How much water did she draw?

Mr. HARE. Thirty feet at present. It has carried the *Indiana* and the *Henderson*, and, as a matter of fact, before the naval station was moved from Port Royal the entire Navy of the United States assembled in this harbor at one time and, as I have said, there was enough room left to accommodate the combined navies of the earth. And yet we find the Navy Department transporting troops almost every day and refusing to stop and take on board marines previously assembled at the barracks there for training. Instead of doing this, they place them on the railroads and carry them nearly a hundred miles around to some other place. You ask me why they do that. I am asking the same question, and it is for this reason that I have offered this amendment. If there is no better reason than that assigned, this amendment should be passed and ships compelled to stop and carry these marines and thereby save the Government thousands of dollars every year.

Mr. BUTLER. Would it not be better to move the marine barracks to some other point?

Mr. HARE. I do not know that it would. The gentleman wants to put me in a position of saying that I am anxious for these marine barracks to stay where they are, but I am not discussing this point. I am interested in transporting the marines to and from these barracks at the least expense. If the Government feels Parris Island is the best place for these barracks, let them stay there, but in transporting the marines from these barracks to other barracks or other points the department should use its own transports whenever it is possible and cheaper to do so.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER. They might not want to leave directly from the marine barracks, because they want to camouflage their movements. Perhaps they are afraid of the Sandino submarines, and the gentleman would not want to handicap the Navy if such a condition should arise?

Mr. HARE. I think the Navy Department would be willing to give that explanation and accept that statement if it were correct. I can not help but think that there must be other

reasons for its failure to send its transports into Port Royal Harbor for the purpose of conveying the marines to other barracks or places, but so far we have not been able to find them out. The thing that interests me is that this country establishes a training station on a harbor accessible to its boats, then when the time comes to move the men, and transports are there, the men are not put on the boats but are carried by rail to their destination.

Mr. EDWARDS. To what point did they take these marines by rail?

Mr. HARE. I have been advised they took some of them to Charleston, S. C., and possibly some to Savannah, Ga., or to Norfolk, Va.

Mr. EDWARDS. If the highway that is being constructed from Parris Island over to Savannah had had the bridge in, we could have taken them over to Savannah by truck and carried them away from a real harbor, could we not?

Mr. HARE. Yes; I think you could have carried them to Savannah that way, but the gentleman is not going to get me to speak disparagingly or say anything derogatory about the harbor at Savannah. No doubt they were placed on board at a good harbor, but certainly at no better harbor than can be found at Port Royal, which is at the very door of the marine barracks, and the point I am making is that they should be loaded at their door and not carried to some other port.

Mr. McMILLAN. Has the gentleman got a harbor at Savannah?

Mr. EDWARDS. If the gentleman will permit, I will say that the gentleman has no harbor there, but Savannah is a great world harbor, and it carries the commerce of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order upon the ground that it is an attempt under the guise of a limitation to direct an executive officer to reach a certain decision, to perform a certain function, before the moneys can be used that are carried in the paragraph.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment is germane. It merely says to the Secretary of the Navy that when transporting these marines from one point to another they shall be carried by the cheapest and most direct route. The bill recites that part of this appropriation is "for transporting of troops," and as the amendment only attempts to say that they shall be transported by the cheapest and most direct route, it appears that the amendment is not only proper but appropriate.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the language itself to indicate that the amendment would reduce the appropriations. On the other hand it does undoubtedly seek to cause an administrative officer in all cases to come to a determination and work out the question from the standpoint of the rule set up here. In a somewhat similar case where a limitation was proposed, Chairman Frederick C. Hicks, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, on January 8, 1923, as indicated on page 48 of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives, made this statement:

As a general proposition whenever a limitation is accompanied by the words "unless," "except," "until," "if," "however," there is ground to view the so-called limitation with suspicion, and in case of doubt as to its ultimate effect the doubt should be resolved on the conservative side.

Then, passing on down in the chairman's decision, he indicates several test questions that seemed to him to be pertinent. The third one is this:

Is the limitation accompanied or coupled with a phrase applying to official functions, and if so, does the phrase give affirmative directions in fact or in effect, although not in form?

It seems to me that this question must immediately be answered by saying that indirectly at least, if not in form, it does do that precise thing.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does not the gentleman think that these marines ought to be transported in the cheapest and most direct manner?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes. Generally speaking they are, and generally speaking I think they ought to be.

Mr. EDWARDS. Why not always?

Mr. FRENCH. Sometimes, it is conceivable, circumstances prevent. Common sense must control.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina reads as follows:

Provided, That none of such amount shall be used in transporting troops or marines to and from marine barracks and other points, except by the cheapest and most direct route.

If the amendment had stopped at the conclusion of the words—

Provided, That none of such amount shall be used in transporting troops or marines to and from marine barracks and other points—

it would be clearly a limitation. It would have forbidden the use of any of the money for the transportation of troops, but it does not entirely prohibit the transportation of troops. It says that such prohibition is to apply except when the transportation is by the cheapest and most direct route. That directs the manner in which the troops or marines shall be transported. It seems to the Chair that it is a direction as to the manner in which certain governmental functions are to be performed rather than a limitation or diminution of the amount that is to be expended.

In this connection the Chair calls attention to a case referred to in section 8693 of a new volume of Hinds' Precedents, a volume not yet published, but which will probably be volume 7, where the caption reads as follows:

8693. Provision that no appropriation provided in the bill be available for any national park "unless" park concessions were granted to highest bidder therefor was held to be legislation and not in order on an appropriation bill.

Under that heading the Chair reads:

On January 29, 1924, the Interior Department bill was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, when the Clerk read:

"Appropriations herein made for construction of physical improvements in national parks shall be immediately available.

Mr. TOM D. McKEOWN, of Oklahoma, offered this amendment:

After the word "available" insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"No appropriation herein made for national parks shall be available for any national park wherein any person, copartnership, or corporation enjoys any exclusive privilege or concession unless such concession or privilege is granted the highest and best bidder for same after due advertisement of the time and place to receive bids under rules and regulations of the commissioner of parks."

The decision was rendered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, who used this language:

The Chair is of the opinion this is not a proper limitation. It is close to the border line, but it does more than limit the appropriation. It goes outside of the realm of limitation and purports to legislate how certain privileges shall be obtained, and also to provide that regulations shall be made by the commissioner of parks, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

It seems to the Chair that the pending amendment would not only legislate as to the manner in which the Commander in Chief—the President himself—should employ appropriations in this bill for the transportation of marines but also would necessitate accounting by the Comptroller General of the United States, who would have to determine in every case whether the money had been properly expended under this provision, thus producing conditions and further expenditures, which, in the opinion of the Chair, render it impossible to say that this amendment would reduce or limit the expenditure of money for the transportation of marines. There are many elements besides distance which enter into the cost of transportation, especially by water. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ALTERATIONS TO NAVAL VESSELS

Toward the alterations and repairs required for the purpose of modernizing the U. S. S. *Oklahoma* and *Nevada*, as authorized by the act entitled "An act to authorize an increase in the limit of cost of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes," approved March 2, 1927, \$6,575,000: *Provided*, That no part of any other appropriation for the fiscal years 1928 and 1929 shall be available for altering, improving, or repairing such ships.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the chairman of the subcommittee be kind enough to indicate the nature of these alterations on these battleships, whether they include gun elevation, or of what character the improvements are?

Mr. FRENCH. I will say to the gentleman that the alterations referred to here include all the major alterations that were referred to in the act which Congress passed on March 2, 1927. They manifestly include alterations for deck protection and aircraft protection and for the elevation of guns and for the modernization of the vessels in general and, in addition to that, such general overhauling as the department would feel justified in giving each ship.

Mr. BRIGGS. Including aircraft guns?

Mr. FRENCH. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. I notice that a number of tests were made last summer; among others, on the *California*, on the Pacific coast. I want to get some idea as to whether any of those results have been reported to your committee, or whether other Members are informed.

Mr. FRENCH. The committee members are advised that the department is wonderfully encouraged with the success that has attended the tests that have been made.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Theoretically.

Mr. FRENCH. Not wholly. Of course, the gentleman must know that these tests are necessarily tests made in the absence of actual war conditions; and yet I will venture to say that those accustomed to the air would not care to be in the place of the target.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Of course, assuming that a fleet of battleships is in a certain attitude at a certain time, when these explosives explode there would be so many hits.

Mr. FRENCH. Antiaircraft guns must be regarded as additional protection. Fighting planes would be met by fighting planes; but even so, we must not brush aside the antiaircraft guns.

Mr. BRIGGS. How far do they carry?

Mr. FRENCH. It is relative; about 3 miles with encouraging results. Of course, the less the range the more accurate the shooting is.

Mr. BRIGGS. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCREASE OF THE NAVY

Construction and machinery: On account of hulls and outfits of vessels and machinery of vessels heretofore authorized, \$31,500,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK of New York: Page 44, line 4, after the word "authorized," strike out "\$31,500,000" and the remainder of the line and insert "\$33,000,000, of which sum \$1,500,000 will be immediately available toward the construction of three fleet submarines."

Mr. BLACK of New York. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, on August 29, 1916, Congress authorized the construction of 9 fleet submarines. Since then we have built 3 and are building 3, leaving the remaining 3 as just so much paper. If we progress as quickly on the 15 cruisers in the naval bill of this year, they will not be finished for about 30 years. The President in his message to Congress this year stated that the Navy needs submarines.

The Naval Affairs Committee stated that it did not authorize new submarines because of the 1916 authorization. It seems to me incumbent, then, on Congress to appropriate for the last three submarines of the existing program, and so I have introduced this amendment.

They can hardly be classified as increases in the Navy, for, after all, they would only be replacements for four submarines decommissioned in 1927 and before they can be built a great many other submarines will be out of commission due to age. One of these submarines, declared out of commission in 1927, was the T-3, a fleet submarine. The British have 16 fleet submarines built and building and 12 more authorized. The Japanese have about 25. This difference in fleet submarines, considering that we have only 3 built and 3 building, unbalances the 5-5-3 ratio.

The submarine is a very formidable instrument of war. In the late war, in one month alone, German submarines destroyed 852,000 tons of shipping. They were such a plague to Great Britain that she had to devote a great part of her marine energy and equipment to offsetting the big German submarines, which could operate at a great distance from their own shores. Japan took over the German submarine experts right after the war, so impressed was this oriental nation with the under-sea craft.

We should not be swayed by Great Britain's objection to submarines, because they threaten her naval superiority. Naval superiority means as much to us as to Great Britain. William Martin, writing in the *Journal of Geneva*, says:

The actual hegemony which Britain has exercised in the world during the nineteenth century, and of which its economic prosperity has been a consequence, has been due in a large measure to the fact that no fleet

could measure itself against the British. The day when this will no longer be true, one will see great changes take place both politically and economically. Naval superiority for the British is not actually a question of security, but a question of supremacy.

Mr. Frank H. Simonds, the well-known American expert on international conditions, says:

We are, then, in my judgment, just at the beginning of a long period of strain in Anglo-American relations. * * * But parity is not a question of ships; it is a question of all that goes to make up British greatness in the political world.

We need these submarines to keep the lanes of the sea open, to protect our commerce, which has just as much right on the high seas as British commerce. The American business man has the same right to expand his trade as the British competitor, and our business must not at any time be interfered with by blockade. As the *Chicago Tribune* well said:

The argument is disingenuous. British naval action in all her later wars has been to blockade her enemy. "Contraband" is what Great Britain wishes to declare. The guarding of imperial communications in fact has meant an interference with neutral commerce whenever it suited British interests to interfere. This has worked a serious injury to American commerce in the past and may do so again as long as the protection of trade routes is allowed to remain a British monopoly. Our interest in foreign trade, while not yet so large as Britain's, is increasing far more rapidly. It is probable, if not certain, that before many years our foreign trade will exceed that of the British Isles. The increase of our trade with foreign countries is largely in manufactured goods, a field in which our superiority to the British is only beginning to show itself. The trend is nowhere clearer than in the British dominions. British exports to Australia in 1924 were some \$20,000,000 less than in 1923; in the same year American exports to Australia increased \$45,000,000, a jump of 40 per cent.

America is beginning to outsell Britain in her own dominions, bound together in a tariff union. Elsewhere in the world we should be able to go ahead even faster. At the same time our dependence on the raw materials of industry which are not found in our country is becoming greater with advances in technology. We must buy such vital materials as manganese and rubber from overseas. They may not be so essential to our life as imported wheat and meat is to Britain's, but the difference is not so great as might at first be imagined. Without some of the raw materials which we draw from the outside world, our industrial system must stagnate. If not our lives, then our prosperity and our standard of living will be imperiled by cutting us off from the world. Britain's interest in protecting trade routes to-day is not much greater than ours, and we can anticipate the time when we shall be fully as dependent on sea communications as are the British. Even now we are giving hostages to fortune in permitting any other nation to dominate our communications.

We have challenged Great Britain commercially and, judging by Britain's historical course, we must always be in a position to back up that challenge by an adequate Navy. Those Americans who keep down the American fleet are quite in line with British thought as to conditions on the high seas. Commander Kenworthy, writing in the *Nation*, says:

Satisfactory as was this elimination of Germany as a naval power, the early months of the peace saw a new rival armada in course of construction. In spite of war additions to the British fleet and the comparatively small loss suffered in capital ships, the naval building program of America was so formidable as to threaten Great Britain's sea supremacy. To the British Admiralty the American challenge seemed serious.

It is now obvious that there is little hope for disarmament. European diplomats have a rather strange plan for disarmament under the League of Nations. Mr. Edwin L. James, writing in the *Times*, concerning it, says:

A schedule shall be drawn up of the land, sea, and air forces which the nations now have or will have on completion of the programs now under way; every nation shall state its strength frankly and accept the status quo at the time of making the schedule; whenever any nation departs from this schedule it must explain to the league and the world in general its reasons for so doing.

We must not let this country lapse in fleet submarine strength. Great Britain has an advantage in capital ships, treaty cruisers, and merchant marine units. We can not equalize this through an American superiority in obsolete small submarines and decommissioned destroyers. We can be a better factor for peace if we are strong. As Lord Nelson said:

There is no better negotiator in the councils of Europe than a fleet of English battleships.

We should also bear in mind that the Navy is for fighting purposes, and Napoleon reminds us that God fights on the side of the heaviest artillery.

We have delayed 12 years now on building these submarines, and there has been no more critical time in the history of our country than the present, and we should adopt this amendment so that we can promptly round out the fleet on which our present security and our future prosperity depend.

Gentlemen, we have been discussing this fleet submarine question ever since I have been in the House, and I have been here now for three terms. In that time we have only managed to build about three submarines, although they were authorized away back in 1916. We have promised the country time and time again that we are going to give them something beyond a mere paper navy. It is all right to tell the country we have passed a naval bill providing for the construction of 15 cruisers; it is all right for the Naval Committee to say there is authorization for three additional submarines, but that is not building submarines and it is not satisfying the country. The temper of this country on the Navy is that they want an actual Navy in condition to fight, and at least on a parity with Great Britain.

We have fallen behind in cruisers. We are behind in fleet submarines and we can not say to the American people that we have 15 new cruisers on paper, we have 3 new fleet submarines on paper, we have 30 or 40 obsolete submarines, and have 100 destroyers out of commission. That is no answer to the American people in these times when there is a demand for a real worth-while Navy.

The other day, after we had passed the naval bill, some of us thought we had accomplished something, but I see the White House has summoned two important Members from the other side of the Capitol to consider this naval bill. I do not think this House should lag behind on this naval proposition. We refused to appropriate for the mine-laying submarine and the Senate had to appropriate for it. Are we going to stand by in this House and watch the Senate build up this Navy or are we going to do something about it? We have as much obligation to do this defense work as the Senate of the United States, and I think it is about time, after 12 years of authorization, that we gave this country some real fleet submarines instead of depending on the six we have.

I hope this amendment will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, just one word in response to the arguments of the gentleman. I am going to pass by most of the statements he has made and get right down to the question of whether or not we want to begin the program he suggests.

In the 1929 bill we are carrying for new construction in aircraft and in ships for the Navy the grand total of \$72,240,000. That includes for dirigibles \$1,800,000; it includes for aircraft \$15,865,000; it includes for modernization \$6,575,000; and it includes money for two submarines and eight cruisers, \$48,000,000. I submit that this is a very vigorous program for the Nation to carry on at a time when the gentleman characterizes the Navy as a paper navy. I submit, gentlemen, that when this country to-day through this Congress is considering a bill that carries more than \$361,000,000 for 1929 the gentleman makes a severe arraignment of naval administration if by any chance whatever he could justify the statement that we have only a paper navy.

Gentlemen, we ought not to build the naval craft in such a way as to cause humps in construction. We ought not to increase the program for one year out of an orderly way of development; we ought to carry on in an even manner. To do what the gentleman proposes to do would mean to raise a hump in the building program for the next year or so, from which, unless we continued to build in a way that is not justified, we would need to recede to a lower level. The amendment ought not to prevail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLACK of New York: Page 44, line 4, after the word "authorized," strike out "\$31,500,000" and insert "\$35,000,000," and also insert the following: "of which sum \$4,500,000 shall be immediately available toward the construction of destroyer leaders."

Mr. BLACK of New York. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I understand the Naval Affairs Committee has stated to the House and to the country that the reason they have not authorized any destroyer leaders is because there is already existing authorization. Unless this amendment is adopted the

destroyer leaders are paper destroyer leaders just as the three fleet submarines are paper fleet submarines.

By denying me the amendment on the submarines you have kept this country behind Great Britain on submarines. You have run away from the 5-5-3 ratio that the President has guaranteed the country we would keep up and that this committee is trying to tell the country we are trying to keep up. We have not a destroyer leader. Great Britain has 17.

Now, what is the use of all this? What is the use of this committee and the President telling the country we need these fleet submarines and we need these destroyer leaders? The President said this in his message, and I still charge, in spite of the one magnificent word of the chairman of the subcommittee, that we have, as far as destroyer leaders are concerned, as far as fleet submarines are concerned, and to a great extent as far as cruisers are concerned, a paper Navy.

The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH], in charge of this bill, has wrecked any additional program as far as actual construction of submarines is concerned. I do not know yet how he feels on destroyer leaders; but if it will give the House any consolation, the gentleman's position on these questions has been well approved in circles other than our own. The record of the gentleman's speech against increased cruiser construction a year or so ago was used by the British admiralty against this country. The gentleman never intended it should be used in that way, but the fact remains that our expert, the chairman of the subcommittee, has been also used in the British Parliament in favor of the British Navy and against ours. The President of the United States has spoken differently from the chairman of the subcommittee, and I think if you are going to follow the President you are going to adopt this amendment even though you did not adopt the last one offered.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK of New York. If the gentleman wants to ask me a question; yes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The gentleman ought to have enough votes from New York to adopt the amendment.

Mr. BLACK of New York. New York can not do everything; but it will be a great thing for the Navy when New York gets control.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLACK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SCHAFFER) there were—ayes 7, noes 37.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

No part of any appropriation made for the Navy shall be expended for any of the purposes herein provided for on account of the Navy Department in the District of Columbia, including personal services of civilians and of enlisted men of the Navy, except as herein expressly authorized: *Provided*, That there may be detailed to the Bureau of Navigation not to exceed at any one time five enlisted men of the Navy: *Provided further*, That enlisted men detailed to the naval dispensary and the radio-communication service shall not be regarded as detailed to the Navy Department in the District of Columbia: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, may assign to the Chief of Naval Operations any public quarters under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department in the District of Columbia.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the proviso at page 45, line 3:

And provided further, That the Secretary of the Navy, in his discretion, may assign to the Chief of Naval Operations any public quarters under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. FRENCH. I suspect that the point of order is well taken, although I also think that what the committee has sought to do would be in the interest of economy and that, possibly, the Secretary of the Navy might have authority under the law to do just what is proposed.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman argue the merits or the point of order so I may be advised?

Mr. FRENCH. I do not care to argue the point of order. I shall be glad to state what it is proposed would be done. On the Naval Observatory grounds is a very large, commodious building that is occupied usually by the Superintendent of the Naval Observatory. The department would like to assign this house to the Chief of Naval Operations.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. So I understand.

Mr. FRENCH. It would mean economy if the Chief of Naval Operations could occupy the property and if the Superintendent of the Naval Observatory could be assigned other quarters;

or on the other hand, if he were to be allowed money for rentals of other quarters. The building itself is so large that not long ago one of the superintendents found it so expensive to keep up that he chose to remain in his own home or at a hotel rather than attempt to keep the building open because the cost of keeping up so large a house was greatly in excess of his allowances for the purpose. We thought it was in the interest of economy to do this thing. I am satisfied it has the support of the Superintendent of the Naval Observatory. I think, however, the language is possibly subject to a point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, this leaves the situation rather undecided. Although the gentleman may not seek to oppose the point of order, he does not concede it. If the gentleman concedes the point of order I have achieved the purpose and further argument is not necessary. This compels me to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the purpose of the proviso, as stated by the gentleman from Idaho, is to dispossess the present Superintendent of the Naval Observatory in order to install in the quarters the present Chief of the Bureau of Operations. The building now occupied by the Superintendent of the Naval Observatory was constructed under an appropriation made in 1889 and is found on page 806 of the twenty-sixth volume of the Statutes at Large, and there the appropriation was specifically made for the residence of the Superintendent of the Naval Observatory, and the proviso here would change existing law in that it would vest in the Secretary of the Navy the authority to assign another officer to the particular quarters.

In other words, these beautiful quarters at this very useful scientific institution are used by the Superintendent of the Naval Observatory. As you know, it is necessary for him to make assignments of scientific men to observe the motions of the heavenly bodies; but instead of having those, it is intended to convert the place into a tea garden where we can have some movements of the flappers observed by the social elite of Washington. [Laughter.] Clearly, it is legislation and changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Without any reference to the purpose of the proviso, it seems clear to the Chair that the proviso changes existing law by authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to assign to the Chief of Naval Operations public quarters under the jurisdiction of the Navy Department in the District of Columbia which may not now be available for that purpose. There is no showing that it would be a retrenchment of expenses under the Holman rule or that it is a limitation upon an appropriation in the bill, and the Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I have a further amendment, to strike out, on page 44, line 22, the words "Provided, That there may be detailed to the Bureau of Navigation not to exceed at any one time five enlisted men of the Navy."

That proviso provides for the detail of five enlisted men to the Bureau of Navigation, and I understand it was in contemplation that they would be needed by the new occupant of the quarters involved in the other proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 44, line 22, after the word "authorized," strike out all down to and including the word "Navy" in line 25.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, the impression of the gentleman from New York as to the five enlisted men in the Bureau of Navigation is entirely incorrect. There are 24 enlisted men now doing work in the Navy Department, and members of the committee feel that the number should be reduced, and that we ought to employ civilians to do the work. It will be cheaper to do so. On the other hand, the department feels that it ought to have about five men from the enlisted personnel who would be available for work in the department that the civilians could not be used for so satisfactorily, and the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation requests us to continue not more than five.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, on the statement made by the gentleman from Idaho, chairman of the subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read to the end of line 7, page 46, of the bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I dare say that every Member in this House is cognizant of the fact that for a number of years past a chain of very powerful and influential newspapers, in the way of

forming public opinion, have incessantly thundered at the idea that it was entirely inconsistent with a well-organized Naval Establishment to continue to build battleships.

I believe that the editorial utterances of these papers—the Hearst papers—have had a decided effect on the minds of many millions of people throughout the country. These utterances have been elaborated by Members of Congress on the floor of the House. I believe the impression exists in a great many sections of the country that the Naval Establishment has not that equipment which could meet successfully the equipment of other countries that depend upon the navy for supremacy in world affairs.

It has occurred to me that there must be some advisory board in existence which might counteract the influences of these newspapers that are apparently honest and sincere in their comments on the establishment of the present Navy if that influence is misdirected or erroneous. It appears to me it might be good policy if we had an advisory board—and, of course, we do have one—to let the country know once in a while that the Nation has a well-balanced Naval Establishment for the standpoint of battleships, if they be necessary, and why they are so, of cruisers, of airplanes, and of submarines. Because it is all important that we should have such an establishment. As the eloquent Bourke Cockran said on the floor of the House on several occasions in speeches which apparently carried intellectual if not political conviction, that a second-class navy was like a second-class poker hand—it led to the destruction of the possessor, because under the belief that he has a better hand than his opponent he will go to defeat with his second-class hand. That is a matter of which the country should be informed. And, if it be consistent with public policy, it appears to me that it should be the duty of any advisory board which may be in existence, or through those that are in confidence of that advisory board on the floor of this House, to make some authoritative statement that would counteract the influence of these great newspapers that are able to crystallize public opinion, and public opinion rules in this country. I believe it was a celebrated literateur who said, "I care not who writes the laws of the country, if you will permit me to write its songs," and along those lines, I care not who makes the laws of the country, if I am in possession of the newspaper facilities that interpret those laws journalistically, which is more effective than judicially with the reading public, and get that interpretation to the country. It is not entirely in the interest of the Naval Establishment to have go uncontradicted the idea that we are not in a well-balanced position, that we are overmanned from the standpoint of battleships which are as obsolete as tapestry, that serve no useful purpose other than to make for the financial gain of the shipbuilders of the country, and it is not well for the people who make up the bone and sinew and the backbone of the Nation to be under the impression that the Navy is not a fighting machine so much as it is an instrumentality to cater to the powerful political interests that are in control of the shipyards. I think that if there is an advisory board, it would be a patriotic act to inform the country that we have a Navy well equipped, well balanced, a fighting machine modern in every respect and able to discharge the duty that we believe is its obligation. [Applause.]

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CHINDELOM, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 12286) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not the Chair will put them en gross. The question is on agreeing to the amendments?

The amendments were agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FRENCH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

A. H. VEAZEY

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it is with much pride that I call to the attention of the House the fact that the honor goes to my district of furnishing the master teacher of agriculture in the South. Mr. A. H. Veazey, of the Rosewood High School, in Wayne County, N. C., in a recent contest was chosen as the master teacher of vocational agriculture of the entire South.

North Carolina has taken its place as one of the leading States of the Nation and it is holding its own along agricultural lines, and Wayne County is one of the most fertile agricultural counties in the country.

The teaching of agriculture and home economics in the rural high schools of this Nation is one of the most effective means of bettering the conditions of our rural population as well as one of the most popular activities yet inaugurated.

There is pending legislation in Congress at the present time to supplement and encourage these activities. This legislation should pass at this session of Congress. It is known as the George-Reed bill.

ADDRESS OF HON. M. H. THATCHER, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by having printed therein an address delivered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. THATCHER] before the Ohio Valley River Improvement Association at Huntington, W. Va.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOWMAN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following address delivered by Hon. H. M. THATCHER.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE OHIO RIVER

Mr. THATCHER. Mr. President, Governor Morgan, members of the association, ladies and gentlemen, I am very glad to be with you this afternoon and to participate with you in this meeting. I am very grateful, also, for the kindness shown me in permitting me to say what I have to say to-day. I am on my way home to Louisville by auto, where I have some important appointments, and I am anxious to get on, but I didn't want to miss this meeting.

At the outset I want to express to you the assurance that so far as I am concerned, not only as a Member of Congress, not only as a Representative of the district in which Louisville is situated, but personally, as well, I am heartily in favor of the earliest possible completion of the Ohio River project; and, also, whenever and wherever and to the extent it may fairly be done, I believe that there should be extension of that system on the Ohio River tributaries.

Now the great Ohio River Valley, as has so often been said, is the most wonderful industrial region in the world. There is nothing like it in all the bounds of the earth. No river flows through such a great industrial country. No river flows through so wonderful a region of wealth, actual and potential, as does the Ohio, and its tributary streams. What you say of the Big Kanawha is true. What you say of the Monongahela is true, and these things are true, in more or less degree, of certain other tributaries of this river, like the Kentucky, and Green River, and the Big Sandy, and the Cumberland River. It is all one great system, and we are now getting back to first principles in transportation matters.

Some time ago I read with much interest the story of the Midland Trail, how in the early days, when it was necessary for the pioneers to drive and trudge across the mountains and through the valleys, when that great stream of migration went westward, there were good roads built through certain stretches here and there—plank roads, turnpikes, and the like; and then came the railroads through these great valleys, and the old Midland Trail fell into more or less disuse. Later came the automobiles, and the old Midland Trail was built anew, better than ever before. In the same way we are going back to the first principles of navigation, and the first principles of transportation; especially so as regards our heavy, nonperishable products of factory and mine.

Two years ago it was my pleasure to be on the great Yangtse-Kiang River in China. I also saw canals everywhere I went in China. They have no roads, but everything there is transported by river and canals. China would die within 24 hours, except for water transportation. They have found that to be the cheapest, and for their purposes, through all ages the most effective method. We are getting back to that condition as to our heavy freights.

I think the country at large is absolutely sold upon the idea of the improvement of the Ohio River Valley. I don't think that Congress needs education on that subject. I think Congress is practically a unit. Of course, I can not speak for all the 435 Members. You know it is sometimes said that a Congressman can hardly speak for himself; but

I believe it is the temper of Congress to make appropriations, and to make them as rapidly and as expeditiously as may be necessary, to complete this project. There was a little hitch two or three years ago, of which, I trust, I may not inappropriately speak at this time. I remember when the Bureau of the Budget cut off \$10,000,000 from the rivers and harbors appropriation, estimates submitted by the Chief of Engineers, it was my pleasure to join with some other Members of Congress who are interested in this great river here, and in the Mississippi River project—men like former Congressman Newton, of St. Louis, who is interested, as you all know, in all these waterways propositions, and we aided in securing a restoration of this necessary sum. The Director of the Budget, I am glad to say, when he examined the subject further submitted to Congress a supplemental estimate therefor. As a result the full amount needed was appropriated that year and the great Ohio River improvement work, and other important river and harbor enterprises, went on without interruption or delay, and, therefore, with the greatest economy of expenditure.

You will find the Chief of Engineers to-day, just as his predecessors have been, sympathetic with the idea of this improvement, because as men of experience, as men of skill, they have known the great value of the early completion of this great work. I believe that I can assure you that adequate appropriations will be made, because this is the temper of Congress. The Members of Congress realize the absolute importance of the completion of this work at an early date. "On to Cairo by 1929" is not a false slogan. It is a true slogan, and in my humble judgment will be fully realized.

Also, I believe you will find Congress sympathetic with the idea of flood control as a national problem, because it is a national problem. There is not too much water on the earth if we know what to do with it; but that question has to be approached carefully, thoughtfully, and in the light of the best judgment, and the best skill, and the best experience, because it is going to cost a tremendous lot of money to work it out; but, to repeat it, it is national in its scope, and Congress should approach it as a national question.

I am glad to be with you this afternoon. I am glad to be with the men here who for 30 years—some of them, at least—have stood shoulder to shoulder in this great work, and have helped to educate not only Congress but the Nation at large, not upon any false promises, not upon any false statements of fact but upon the naked truth about this great waterway.

It was my great pleasure to travel on the great River Rhine this summer. I traveled by steamer all the way from West Baden down to the city of Cologne, and I was absolutely amazed at the amount of shipping on that river. I can now understand how those great industrial countries, Germany and France, might be perpetually at strife or in rivalry over the control of that great stream. We met hundreds and hundreds of barges, and innumerable tows of steel and coal and iron and other commodities going up that river. That was typical of practically every day of the year as I was told, and yet we have a greater river here, a stream of greater potential wealth! I believe that only on the lower stretches of the Monongahela River is the tonnage on the Rhine exceeded anywhere on the rivers of the earth. But we will have in this great valley, in this great region, with all of its great wealth, within two or three years incomparable the greatest river system in the world; and this dream of dreams will come true; and when it does come true, nobody will deserve more credit for it than the Ohio Valley Improvement Association and its officers and members. I thank you. [Applause.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Calendar Wednesday, to-morrow, the order of committees be changed so that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will be called next, instead of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that on Calendar Wednesday next the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall have the call ahead of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Is there objection?

Mr. BLACK of New York. Reserving the right to object, does the gentleman know whether the so-called Burton resolution respecting an embargo on arms is to be called up?

Mr. TILSON. It is understood that it is not to be called up to-morrow.

Mr. GARNER of Texas. And this is agreeable to the chairmen of the two committees?

Mr. TILSON. This is done at the request of the committees directly concerned, and it will save Calendar Wednesday for Calendar Wednesday business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolutions of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 9663. An act authorizing Herman Simmonds, jr., his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across Tampa Bay from Pinellas Point, Pinellas County, to Piney Point, Manatee County, Fla.;

H. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution to provide for the entry under bond of exhibits for display at the Pacific Southwest Exposition to be held in commemoration of the landing of the Spanish padres in the Pacific Southwest and the opening of the Long Beach, Calif., world port, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 245. Joint resolution to make immediately available the appropriation for a road across the Kaibab Indian Reservation.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1279. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to compromise and settle certain suits at law resulting from the subsidence of First Street east, in the District of Columbia, occasioned by the construction of a railroad tunnel under said street;

S. 2310. An act supplementary to, and amendatory of, the incorporation of the Catholic University of America, organized under and by virtue of a certificate of incorporation pursuant to class 1, chapter 18, of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia; and

S. 3387. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the Tenth National Convention of the American Legion.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on the following dates they presented to the President of the United States for his approval bills of the following titles:

On March 24, 1928:

H. R. 340. An act to authorize the incorporated town of Anchorage, Alaska, to issue bonds for the construction and equipment of an additional school building, and for other purposes; and

On March 27, 1928:

H. R. 9860. An act to amend the act of April 25, 1922, as amended, entitled "An act authorizing extensions of time for the payment of purchase money due under certain homestead entries and Government-land purchases within the former Cheyenne River and Standing Rock Indian Reservations, N. Dak. and S. Dak."

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes, p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, March 28, 1928, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday, March 28, 1928, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

(10 a. m.)

To provide for the eradication or control of the European corn borer (H. R. 10377).

COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

(10 a. m.)

Authorizing an appropriation for development of potash jointly by the United States Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Mines of the Department of Commerce by improved methods of recovering potash from deposits in the United States (H. R. 496).

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

(10 a. m.)

To consider proposed legislation governing insurance.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

(10 a. m.)

To amend the immigration act of 1924 (H. R. 8540).

Amending the immigration laws as applied to Porto Rico (H. R. 10956).

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

(10.30 a. m.)

To require the prompt rendition of accounts (H. R. 12180).

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

(2 p. m.)

To amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate

and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the transportation act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924 (H. R. 10710).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

420. Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriations pertaining to the legislative establishment, United States Senate, for the fiscal year 1929, in the sum of \$100,000 (H. Doc. 207), was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 148. A resolution providing for the consideration of S. J. Res. 113, S. 716, and H. R. 12407, bills relating to immigration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1056). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SNELL: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 149. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 279, a bill relating to Howard University; without amendment (Rept. No. 1057). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MICHENER: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 150. A resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 8927, a bill to amend the act to promote export trade; without amendment (Rept. No. 1058). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SEARS of Florida: Committee on Roads. H. Res. 117. A resolution authorizing the United States Bureau of Public Roads to make a survey of the uncompleted bridges of the Overseas Highway from Key West to the mainland, in the State of Florida, with a view of obtaining the cost of the construction of said bridges, and report their findings to Congress; with amendment (Rept. No. 1059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HAWLEY: Committee on Ways and Means. H. J. Res. 253. A joint resolution authorizing certain customs officials to administer oaths; without amendment (Rept. No. 1060). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 12407. A bill to authorize the refund of visa fees in certain cases; without amendment (Rept. No. 1061). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KENDALL: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. H. R. 57. A bill to enable the Postmaster General to authorize the establishment of temporary or emergency star-route service from a date earlier than the date of the order requiring such service; with amendment (Rept. No. 1062). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12394) granting an increase of pension to Emma Steer; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12395) for the relief of Greenville News Co.; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 12441) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act in reference to writs of error," approved January 31, 1928, Public, No. 10, Seventieth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIGHAM: A bill (H. R. 12442) to provide for the transfer to the Department of Labor of certain forfeited vehicles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 12443) authorizing improvements at the Fort Mohave Indian School, Arizona; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12444) to authorize the construction of a telephone line from Flagstaff to Kayenta, on the Western Navajo Indian Reservation, Ariz.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NIEDRINGHAUS: A bill (H. R. 12445) to charter the National Society of Woman Descendants of the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York: A bill (H. R. 12446) to approve a deed of conveyance of certain land in the Seneca Oil Spring Reservation, N. Y.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SWING (by request): A bill (H. R. 12447) providing against future floods on the Mississippi and other rivers and for their uninterrupted navigation by restoration of natural channels by reservoirs, dredging, and reclamation operation, making available thereby vast quantities of valuable God-given fertilizer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 12448) to provide for the national defense by the creation of a corporation for the operation of the Government properties at and near Muscle Shoals, in the State of Alabama, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12449) to define the terms "child" and "children" as used in the acts of May 18, 1920, and June 10, 1922; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 12450) authorizing an appropriation of certain funds standing to the credit of the Cherokee Nation in the Treasury of the United States to be paid to one of the attorneys for the Cherokee Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 12451) to establish an assay office at Dahlonega, Lumpkin County, Ga.; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 12452) further to provide for the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of Iowa: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 252) authorizing assistance in the construction of an inter-American highway on the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 253) authorizing certain customs officials to administer oaths; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 254) for the appointment of O. W. Coursay, of South Dakota, as member of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. PRALL: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to provide a suitable institution in the State of New York to care for United States prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 12453) granting a pension to Alvord Queen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12454) to provide for an examination and survey of Totuskey Creek, Richmond County, Va., and of the channel connecting said creek with Rappahannock River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 12455) granting an increase of pension to Josephine E. Gorham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON: A bill (H. R. 12456) awarding a congressional medal of honor to Lincoln Ellsworth; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 12457) for the relief of Harry J. Kennedy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12458) for the relief of William Wood; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12459) granting a pension to Frank A. Kelley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12460) granting a pension to Hannah M. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12461) for the relief of Theodore Reynders; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 12462) granting a pension to Mary E. Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOFFMAN: A bill (H. R. 12463) for the relief of Adam A. Schultz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 12464) granting a pension to Clara V. McCampbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 12465) granting an increase of pension to Ida P. Hazlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 12466) granting a pension to Harriet Owings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 12467) granting a pension to Marion Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MENGES: A bill (H. R. 12468) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12469) granting a pension to Clara J. Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 12470) for the relief of William Fair; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORTON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 12471) granting a pension to Roberta Salter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'BRIEN: A bill (H. R. 12472) granting an increase of pension to Lulu E. Skinner; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PRALL: A bill (H. R. 12473) for the relief of Thomas Vincent Corey; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SCHAFER: A bill (H. R. 12474) granting an increase of pension to Lora L. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 12475) for the relief of Alfred L. Diebolt, sr., and Alfred L. Diebolt, jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 12476) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth E. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12477) granting a pension to Nancy Mayes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELLER: A bill (H. R. 12478) granting an increase of pension to Mary Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6025. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of residents of the seventh congressional district of California, protesting against the Lankford Sunday bill (H. R. 78); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6026. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of Louis F. Mayerson, of 60 West One hundred and ninetieth Street, New York City, and other citizens of New York, protesting against House bill 78, Lankford Sunday bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6027. By Mr. BOHN: Petition of citizens of Munising, Mich., for maintenance of the national origins plan of determining immigration quotas; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6028. By Mr. BOWLES: Petition of 117 citizens of Hampden County, Mass., urging that immediate steps be taken to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill carrying the rates proposed by the National Tribune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6029. By Mr. BURTON: Petition of voters of Hambden, Geauga County, Ohio, earnestly advocating the passage of legislation increasing the pensions of Civil War veterans and their widows and dependents; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6030. Also, resolution adopted by the Cuyahoga Chapter, No. 7, D. A. V. of the World War, at a meeting of March 25, 1928, approving the Dale-Lehlbach retirement bill (H. R. 25 and S. 1727); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6031. Also, resolution adopted by Prokop Velky Lodge, No. 708, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, at a meeting of March 21, 1928, approving the Dale-Lehlbach retirement bill (H. R. 25 and S. 1727); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6032. Also, resolution adopted by the Independent Order of Foresters, Cleveland, Ohio, at a meeting of March 21, 1928, approving the Dale-Lehlbach retirement bill (H. R. 25 and S. 1727); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6033. Also, resolution adopted by Lafayette Commandery No. 19, Knights of St. John, Cleveland, Ohio, approving the Dale-Lehlbach retirement bill (H. R. 25 and S. 1727); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6034. Also, resolutions adopted by Painters Local No. 867, Cleveland, Ohio, approving the Dale-Lehlbach retirement bill (H. R. 25 and S. 1727); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6035. Also, resolution adopted by the Cleveland Waiters Union, No. 106, Cleveland, Ohio, at a meeting of March 23, 1928, approving the Dale-Lehlbach retirement bill (H. R. 25 and S. 1727); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6036. Also, resolution adopted by Carpenters' Local Union, No. 1242, Cleveland, Ohio, at a meeting held March 19, 1928, indorsing the Dale-Lehlbach retirement bill (H. R. 25 and S. 1727); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6037. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of California Indian Brotherhood, Stephen Knight, president, urging the passage of legislation compensating the California Indians for their lost lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

6038. By Mr. CHALMERS: Petition against compulsory Sunday observance, signed by constituents of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6039. By Mr. CHINDELOM: Petition of 43 citizens of Chicago and vicinity, filed by Edward R. Lewis, favoring national-origins system in immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6040. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of Roosevelt Camp No. 9, United Spanish War Veterans, for the enactment of a special bill for the relief of Frank Schallert; to the Committee on Pensions.

6041. By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of citizens of Montgomery County, N. Y., for the passage of the bill known as House bill 11410; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6042. Also, petition of citizens of Gloversville, N. Y., for the Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6043. By Mr. DALLINGER: Resolution of the commandery of the State of Massachusetts, Military Order of the Loyal Legion, that certain changes be made in House bill 10286; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6044. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Petition of citizens of Yreka, Calif., protesting against passage of House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6045. Also, petition of citizens of Day, Modoc County, Calif., protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6046. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of American Legion Auxiliary, Flora F. Chapin, State legislative chairman, Worcester, Mass., protesting against the Burton resolution (H. J. Res. 183); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6047. By Mr. HALL of North Dakota: Petition of eight citizens living in North Dakota, for the enactment of the Dale-England bills (H. R. 9502 and 9766); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6048. By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: Petition of voters of Clinton, Ind., for the increase of Civil War pensions; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6049. By Mr. KERR: Resolution of indorsement of House bill 12241, providing additional Federal funds for the teaching of vocational education, presented by the North Carolina Teachers' Association; to the Committee on Education.

6050. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of State Association of County Commissioners of Minnesota, in annual convention, by E. J. Kramer, secretary, urging that counties be reimbursed by the Federal Government for additional expenses incurred through incarceration of Federal prisoners in county jails; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6051. Also, petition of Jack J. Schener, for Department of Minnesota, Veterans of Foreign Wars, urging enactment of the resolution proposing to make the Star-Spangled Banner the national anthem of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6052. By Mr. LEHLBACH: Petition of the Sons and Daughters of Liberty, of the tenth congressional district of New Jersey; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6053. Also, petition of the Patriotic Order of Americans, Camp No. 38, of the tenth congressional district of New Jersey; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6054. By Mr. MOORE of Virginia: Petition of Thomas E. Ward, Mrs. E. H. Ward, Lillian W. Beem, and others, protesting against the enactment of House bill 78, the Lankford compulsory Sunday observance bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6055. By Mrs. NORTON of New Jersey: Petition of Edwin H. Johnson and several others, of Jersey City, N. J., protesting against House bill 78; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6056. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the Vivisection Investigation League, New York City, with reference to legislation pertaining to the vivisection of dogs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6057. Also, petition of Binney & Smith Co., New York City, favoring the passage of Cooper bill (H. R. 7729) relating to prison-made goods; to the Committee on Labor.

6058. By Mr. PRALL: Resolution received from the board of estimate and apportionment of the city of New York, approving the proposed subdivision d of section 116 of House bill 1; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6059. Also, petition adopted at a regular meeting of the eastern broker division, Commercial Telegraphers Union of America, held March 22, 1928, received from J. W. Dunn, presi-

dent, 24 Stone Street, New York City, N. Y.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6060. By Mr. QUAYLE: Petition of Admiral Schley Naval Squadron, No. 10, of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the passage of House bill 6518; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

6061. Also, petition of Walter Otis Loomis, urging the passage of Senate bill 777; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6062. Also, petition of McCrory Stores Corporation, urging the passage of House bill 12030; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6063. Also, petition of Aviators Post, American Legion, New York, urging the passage of Senate bill 777; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6064. Also, petition of Second Division Chapter, National Council of Officials of the Railway Mail Service, of New York, urging the passage of House bill 11622; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

6065. Also, petition by the board of estimate and apportionment of the city of New York, requesting Congress amend section 116 of the Federal income tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6066. Also, petition of legionnaires of the State of New York, urging the passage of the Tyson bill; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

6067. Also, petition of Amsterdam Broom Co., urging the passage of the Hawes-Cooper bill; to the Committee on Labor.

6068. Also, petition of Stag Broom & Brush Co., urging the passage of the Hawes-Cooper bill; to the Committee on Labor.

6069. Also, petition of prison officials committee, against the passage of the Hawes-Cooper bill; to the Committee on Labor.

6070. Also, petition of Eastern Broker Division of the Commercial Telegraphers Union of America, opposing the passage of the McNary-Haugen bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6071. Also, petition of Gardner Broom Co. of Amsterdam, N. Y., urging the passage of the Hawes-Cooper bill; to the Committee on Labor.

6072. Also, petition of American Broom & Brush Co. of Amsterdam, N. Y., urging the passage of the Hawes-Cooper bill; to the Committee on Labor.

6073. Also, petition of Sweet-Orr & Co. (Inc.), urging the passage of the Hawes-Cooper bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6074. Also, petition of Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing Congress to provide a suitable institution in the State of New York in which to confine those charged with or convicted of crime against the Government of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6075. By Mr. ROMJUE: Petition of Sarah M. Jones, Jane Johnston et al., of Queen City, Mo., for passage of Civil War pension bill carrying the rates proposed by the National Tribune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

6076. By Mr. SANDERS of Texas: Resolutions by the Troup (Tex.) Chamber of Commerce, asking for an appropriation of \$6,000,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, to provide for immediate and active prosecution of the work in exterminating the pink bollworm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6077. By Mr. SNELL: Petition of board of estimate and apportionment of New York State, relative to section 116 of the Federal income tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6078. By Mr. SWING: Petition of citizens of Banning, Calif., and vicinity, protesting against compulsory Sunday observance laws; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6079. By Mr. THATCHER: Petition of numerous citizens of Louisville, Ky., protesting against the enactment of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, March 28, 1928

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 27, 1928)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 12286) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1929, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.